

Union, and other citizens of Ozark County, urging the passage of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1521. Also, petition of 82 members of the Central Methodist Church of Webb City, Mo., urging the passage of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, let us not be content to wait and see what will happen, but give us the determination to make the right things happen.

While time is running out, save us from patience which is akin to cowardice.

Give us the courage to be either hot or cold, to stand for something, lest we fall for anything.

In Jesus' name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 9, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On March 8, 1948:

S. 1195. An act to repeal the laws relating to the length of tours of duty of officers and enlisted men of the Army at certain foreign stations.

On March 9, 1948:

S. 703. An act to authorize the carrying of Civil War battle streamers with regimental colors;

S. 1267. An act for the relief of Eleonore M. Hannon; and

S. 1802. An act to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to the unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War.

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

### RATIFICATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a certified copy of a joint resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the term of the office of the President, which was ordered to lie on the table.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

### AMENDMENTS OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK, AND NATIONAL HOUSING ACTS

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting two drafts of proposed legislation to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes, and to amend section 19 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and subsection (c) of section 402 of the National Housing Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

### REPORT CONCERNING COURTHOUSE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A report made to Congress pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 80, Eightieth Congress, by the committee appointed thereunder, concerning the proposed construction of a building in the District of Columbia for the use of the United States Court of Appeals and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

### PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of S. B. Cooperthwaite, of New Haven, Conn., praying for the enactment of the so-called Marshall European recovery program; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the assembly of the Gran Logia, Regional No. 1, de la Orden Fraternal de Odd-Fellows Latinos, Rio Piedras, P. R., relating to the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### PROHIBITION AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the National Antivice Crusade, with headquarters at Lincoln, Nebr., expressing their support of the so-called Capper bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages. I ask unanimous consent to present the letter for appropriate reference and request that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL ANTIVICE CRUSADE,  
Lincoln, Nebr., March 6, 1948.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,  
United States Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We, the undersigned national officials for the organization known as the National Antivice Crusade, do tender to you for your records the following resolution:

Resolved, That we, the National Antivice Crusade of these United States of America, are in accord with the Capper bill to prohibit the advertising of all alcoholic beverages.

Authorized this 6th day of March by the official board of the National Antivice Crusade as by the president of said organization.

ISAAC B. FLINT  
(Evangelist Isaac B. Flint),  
First Vice President and  
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

For the National Antivice Crusade:  
Rev. EDGAR J. WRIGLEY,  
President.

Rev. JOSEPH RICHARDS,  
Executive Vice President.

WALLACE MEMMER,  
Assistant Executive Vice President.

### TAX AND CONTROLS ON BUTTER SUBSTITUTES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a resolution adopted by the Kansas Inter-Breed Dairy Cattle Council in special session February 25, 1948, at Manhattan, Kans., urging that the Congress keep the present tax and controls on butter substitutes in order that the best interests of the entire population be served over a long period of time. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution for appropriate reference and request that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted by Kansas Inter-Breed Dairy Cattle Council in special session February 25, 1948, at Manhattan, Kans.

Whereas the State of Kansas ranks thirteenth in total milk production among the States of the Nation; and

Whereas the dairy industry is the third largest source of agricultural income in Kansas, with a total of about \$90,000,000 annually; and

Whereas 87 percent of the farmers of Kansas depend on the dairy business for a part of their income; and

Whereas the dairy industry is the largest single source of agricultural income exceeding wheat, cotton, and soybeans combined; and

Whereas the butter industry is the backlog of the dairy industry representing nearly half the total butterfat marketed; and

Whereas disturbance of the butter industry would seriously jeopardize the other phases of the dairy industry such as the marketing of milk, ice cream, etc., to the detriment of the nutritional welfare of the Nation and particularly such segments of the consuming public as children and pregnant mothers; and

Whereas the removal of taxes and other existing controls of butter substitutes threatens to seriously affect the welfare of a large segment of the agricultural population which represents all the best standards of agricultural community life, and also threatens to jeopardize the welfare of the consumer: Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Inter-Breed Dairy Cattle Council, representing six dairy cattle breed associations in Kansas, go on record as urging the Congress of the United States to keep the present taxes and controls on butter substitutes in order that the best interests of the entire population may be best served over a long period of time. Particularly do we urge that the representatives of the State of Kansas in both the Senate and House be specially on guard that the best interests of Kansas which is primarily an agricultural and exporting State be served effectively.

Prof. F. W. ATKESON,  
Chairman.  
JOHN WEIR, JR.,  
ROSS ZIMMERMAN,  
Committee.

### OPERATIONS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, pursuant to Senate Resolution 132, Eightieth Congress, first session, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report accompanied by an original bill relating to the operations of the Reconstruction Fi-

nance Corporation, and I submit a report (No. 974) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2287) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

#### REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawing a nomination, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 2284. A bill to authorize the construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 2285. A bill relating to the fixing of wage rates for employees in navy yards; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 2286. A bill to provide for nonreimbursable allocations on the Carlsbad Federal reclamation project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original bill (S. 2287) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.)

(Mr. WILEY (by request) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 195, authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim June 20, 1948, as Emblem Day, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

#### EMBLEM DAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was on the 20th of June 1782 that the Continental Congress selected the American bald eagle as the official emblem of the United States of America. As every Senator knows, the bald eagle constitutes a part of the great seal of the American Republic, and also appears on the Presi-

dent's flag. This emblem is indeed a symbol of the American ideals of courage, trustworthiness, and ability to get things done. The eagle can fly above the storm and can see what goes on, so to speak. It was indeed a historic and striking event, when we contemplate it, when the founding fathers selected the bald eagle as an emblem of the young Republic.

All through the years of man's growth toward the light, Mr. President, man has indulged in the use of symbols. Back in the early days of the Christian era, we remember that the Christians would recognize each other by drawing a fish on the sand. We also remember that the church was symbolized by a ship, and that the peacock stood for immortality, and the phoenix for resurrection.

I may say, Mr. President, that there is in the United States a great organization known as the Eagles. This year they are celebrating their fiftieth birthday. Their national symbol is the American bald eagle. That organization is the only fraternal organization in the world bearing the name "Eagles," and whose cardinal principles are symbolized by the eagle.

Their principles are liberty, truth, justice, and equality. Judge Albert H. Schmidt, one of Wisconsin's distinguished citizens, residing at Manitowoc, is in the National Capital today. He is national chairman of the national emblem committee of the Grand Eyrie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. It was a Wisconsin idea—one of Wisconsin's many pioneering concepts—that there should be a National Emblem Day.

Mr. President, I am introducing a joint resolution at the request of my distinguished friend, and on behalf of the Eagles, an American patriotic institution that has stood foursquare for the things that we know comprise the American idea. I ask unanimous consent to introduce the joint resolution for appropriate reference, and request that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 195) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim June 20, 1948, as Emblem Day, introduced by Mr. WILEY (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the bald eagle, commonly known as the American eagle, was on the 20th day of June 1782 selected by the Continental Congress as the official emblem of the United States of America; and

Whereas the bald eagle thus became the symbolic representation of a new nation under a new government in a new world, imprinted on the Great Seal of the new Republic, carried in brass effigy above the colors, and appearing on the President's flag; and

Whereas the American bald eagle, by the act of that Congress, and by tradition and custom during the life of this Nation, has come to be recognized as a symbol of the American ideals of freedom: Therefore be it Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the 20th day of June 1948 as Emblem Day, calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on such day, and inviting

the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the American eagle, the official emblem of the United States, and of the great principles and ideals which it represents and symbolizes, and to renew and rededicate their faith in such principles and ideals.

#### REDUCTION OF INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TAFT submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4790) to reduce individual income-tax payments, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

#### THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT AT PHILADELPHIA

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of the Taft-Hartley Act, delivered by Senator TAFT at the Philadelphia Bulletin Forum on March 9, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE SOUTH AND THE PRESIDENT'S CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued March 9, 1948, by Senator OVERTON regarding the attitude of the South toward the civil-rights program which appears in the Appendix.]

#### SENATOR HATCH'S MESSAGE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NASHVILLE TENNESSEAN

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator Hatch's Message," from the Nashville Tennessean of March 6, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### JUSTICE FOR POSTMEN—EDITORIAL FROM THE NASHVILLE BANNER

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Justice for Postmen," from the Nashville Banner of March 5, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT—SUMMARY BY NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the Taft-Hartley Act, prepared by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSIONS

During the course of Mr. TAYLOR's speech, subsequently delivered,

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield for two or three unanimous-consent requests, with the understanding that he will not thereby lose the floor?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield on the suggestion of my friend the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the senior Senator from Idaho for the courtesy. I am sorry to interrupt him, but I wanted the unanimous-consent requests to appear at another place in the RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Exports of the Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business be permitted to meet this afternoon. There are several witnesses here from the Pacific coast who are anxious to start back tonight.



The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in behalf of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee may meet this afternoon. Witnesses are present from a distance, and we should like to continue with the hearing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency may sit this afternoon and tomorrow during the sessions of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee handling the independent offices bill is trying to get that bill ready for action on the Senate floor at the time when the debate on the ERP bill now before the Senate is concluded. In order to do so, we must work both mornings and afternoons. As chairman of that subcommittee, I ask unanimous consent that we may have the consent of the Senate to sit this afternoon and tomorrow afternoon, if necessary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the announcement made at the close of the session last night, about a quarter of seven, with respect to holding sessions of the Senate Thursday night and Friday night.

As I understand, at this time the Senate will proceed with the unfinished business, and, under the unanimous consent order, the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] has the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Idaho.

#### EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, before I proceed with my prepared remarks, I should like to read into the RECORD an excerpt from a British publication entitled "The Electrical Review." I believe that what is recorded here is emblematic of the entire so-called Marshall plan and its inconsistencies. I read from this British publication:

It is somewhat surprising to learn that the Marshall plan for aid to Europe includes an item of \$141,000,000 worth of electrical equipment for Great Britain spread over the next 4 years. This represents an annual average value of nearly \$9,000,000; the total value of our imports of electrical machinery and apparatus during 1947 was of the order of \$3,000,000. So far we have been unable to obtain particulars of the kind of equipment

which the United States proposes to send us but it would have to be of a very special character to be acceptable. It would be absurd for us to continue to deprive home industries of much-needed electrical apparatus for the sake of export trade and then take similar equipment from America. It is true that we will not be expected to pay dollars for these goods—immediately at any rate—but the principle seems to be all wrong.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that we are simply trying to find ways and means of dumping our excess production abroad in the hope that by so doing we will get foreign nations accustomed to our products, and, as I have said previously, find markets for the day when home consumption can no longer take up the slack.

At the close of my remarks yesterday I had just finished pointing out that the press of America has seemed to go out of its way to inflame the minds of the American people against the Russians, but at the time I concluded yesterday I had pointed out that I had noticed a number of articles recently in the press and in other places indicating that this trend was changing. I pointed out several articles I had recently seen seeking to present a fair picture of the Russians as people, not as ogres or devils with horns. I hope this is indicative of a reversal in this trend.

David Lawrence has written some excellent articles calculated to ease the tension between ourselves and the Russians.

God knows we need cool heads who will start throwing at least a little water on the flames of hate and prejudice and misunderstanding that threaten to engulf us and the world. But enough of this. I set out to castigate the press for their sins. I am happy that I was able to wind up with a good word or two for some of them.

#### THE FULTON, MO., SPEECH

Now, Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the Fulton, Mo., speech. I am sure everyone knows to what I refer without further elaboration.

To add to the bitterness engendered by the hate campaign in the press and over the radio, Mr. Churchill came to America and he went to Fulton, Mo., as the guest of the President of the United States, and there he made a speech that did more to undermine our relations with Russia than any one thing that had occurred up to that time. He suggested a military alliance against the Russians, for obviously there was no other nation against whom an alliance could be aimed.

Up to that time, Mr. President, there had been a certain freedom of access to our people in finding out what went on in Russia. I talked to many members of UNRRA missions, press representatives, and just plain citizens, who had been to Russia before that time, and they said there was no iron curtain. They said they went where they pleased and saw what they pleased.

I might interpolate that one of the gentlemen with whom I talked, who had been to Russia as head an UNRRA mission, was a Republican lawyer of New York, so he could not have been expected to be pro-Russian; but he stated that

he had been allowed to go where he pleased, and to see what he pleased, and that his freedom of action had not been interfered with.

Churchill likes to coin new phrases and make daring suggestions and hold the spotlight. Certainly, after the damage he did to the hopes of mankind on that one day at Fulton, Mo., he should have his belly full, he should be satisfied to rest on his laurels to his dying day.

But he is not satisfied. He still goes about, coining his phrases and cooking up his schemes. Among all the elder statesmen of all the nations his only rival in creating distrust and suspicion is Herbert Hoover.

#### MILITARY INFILTRATION

Mr. President, what would we have thought if, with the end of the war, the Russians had made Marshal Voroshilov, their war hero, their Foreign Secretary? Then suppose they had sent old Budenny, the general with the handlebar mustaches, over here as their Ambassador to Washington. And suppose they had sent generals hither and yon to represent them in the various capitals of the world. What would we have thought?

Would we have thought their intentions were peaceful? Or would we have been alarmed and distrustful? I am happy to say they did not do that. I wish I could say as much for us. No, the Russians did not do these things. One might almost wish they had because then our own actions would not appear in such an unfavorable light by comparison.

What were our actions in this regard? Our greatest war hero, our wartime Chief of Staff, became our Secretary of State on January 21, 1947.

Mr. President, I have a high regard for General Marshall, as a general, but is it reasonable to expect a man who has spent his adult life as a professional soldier suddenly to forget that background simply because he has been appointed to a civilian administrative position, indeed, the most important civilian post in America, aside from the Presidency?

The Secretary of State is ordinarily thought of as possessing the characteristics of a diplomat, a pourer of oil on troubled waters, a man who can engage in long and difficult negotiations without becoming impatient or exasperated—one who can compromise, cajole, give and take. Certainly, a military man is not schooled in any of these things. He is taught to run rough-shod over all opposition, to give orders and have them obeyed without question, and not to compromise with the enemy.

I think the military type of mind can best be summed up in the actions of General McAuliff at Bastogne when he was called upon to surrender and answered, "Nuts!" Very admirable behavior for a military man, but hardly the proper attitude for the conference table.

I think General Marshall is as well qualified, and no better qualified to be Secretary of State than would that master diplomat, Sumner Welles, be qualified to be Chief of Staff.

One day General Marshall was Chief of Staff, planning, and capably, I will



warrant, how we could keep such a military advantage over other nations as to guarantee our military security absolutely—no job of planning for peace through negotiations, kindly overtures, or disarmament proposals—but the next day he simply moved into a different chair where he was supposed to be a changed man completely. I just do not believe that can happen. I do not believe it did happen, with all due respect to General Marshall.

But, to continue with the story of our military: General Bedell Smith became our envoy to Moscow. Could that be construed by any stretch of the imagination as a friendly, peaceful gesture toward our wartime ally?

I wonder what the Russians thought. I wonder what the whole world thinks of all the military men we have sent into many foreign countries to fill diplomatic positions which have traditionally been the province of civilians.

I do not believe that it was a happy decision to embark upon such a course.

Certainly, the collapse of our vitally important relations with Panama, which it is largely agreed was the result of the bungling and incompetence of a general who, while he may have been a good general, was utterly lost in the field of diplomacy, should make us stop and consider.

As I say, the results of this policy have been to create suspicion and mistrust of our motives among the nations of the world and insofar as I can see, without compensating advantages. Certainly, it has not helped to win the confidence of the Russians. There are other things we have done which have not been conducive to good relations with the Russians.

#### IRAN—OIL AND GUNS

For example, we are in Iran exploiting their oil resources, that is, our private companies are.

As we all know, Iran is situated with relation to Russia quite similarly to the position that Mexico occupies geographically with relation to us. How would we feel if the Russians came into Mexico and started carting away the oil—oil that we need. Would we be happy about it?

And suppose we went down to Mexico and said, "Now look here, we do not mind Russia having some of this oil but we want some, too." And suppose we negotiated a lease for oil concessions in Mexico? We thought we were all fixed up, but then the lease came up for ratification by the Mexican Congress. And then if we can imagine such a thing, the Russians sent a message to Mexico and said, "You do not need to ratify that lease of Uncle Sam's unless you want to and we will back you to the hilt."

Well, Mr. President, that thing has happened in Iran.

The Russians did negotiate an oil concession with the Iranian Government. They may have used questionable tactics in doing so.

I do not know as to that. I doubt if they were any more questionable than the tactics we used in getting the Panama Canal right-of-way, for example.

And the Iranians could have appealed to the United Nations if they did not like

it. Nevertheless, when that treaty came up for ratification by the Iranian Parliament we sent the Iranians a note and said, "Do not sign that agreement with the Russians unless you want to, and we will back you to the hilt."

When I read that, Mr. President, the words "to the hilt" were in quotation marks, to give them added emphasis, and of course, everyone knows that when we say "to the hilt" we mean the atom bomb.

I am afraid that if the Russians had done a thing like that to us it would have meant war.

The only reason our actions have not brought war is because the Russians are too devastated, too unprepared to fight.

Now, we have a military mission in Iran, training the Iranian Army. Doubtless, we are sending in military equipment. The Army does pretty much as it pleases about such matters nowadays without bothering to ask Congress. Witness the recent disclosure that we have been secretly sending our airplanes to Chiang Kai-shek. There might never have been a word said about that but all of a sudden the Republicans went crazy and started yelling for aid to China, so our supercolossal military boys gave forth with the good news, the glad tidings, that they had been black-marketing aid to Chiang right along without bothering to ask that silly old man with whiskers otherwise known as Congress.

Suppose the Russians sent a military mission into Mexico—started training a Red Army and supplying them with military equipment. Do you think we would like it? I would not. I would be one of the first to insist that such unfriendly action should cease immediately.

Perhaps the reason the Russians have not been so bold as we might be is because they do not have an atom bomb; although I read in the newspapers the other day that some scientist said that one other nation did have the atom bomb. I do not know what nation that may be. He said, however, that the other nation did not have enough atom bombs to start an atomic war yet, and therefore there was no object in our reaching any agreement as to the control of atom bombs, because it would simply whittle down the advantage we had at the present time. In other words, this one gentleman thought evidently that when the Russians got enough atom bombs so they could talk turkey on equal terms, then we might come to some agreement limiting the use of atom bombs or abolishing their use.

Their country is devastated. They are not in the position to be as tough as we would be under the circumstances.

#### TURKEY

Now, let us take a look at Turkey.

The Turkish Government is utterly reactionary. Its people have no more political freedom and much less economic security than the people of Russia. Nevertheless, we are backing up that Government. We are in Turkey dredging the harbors and building roads.

What would we think if the Russians came into Mexico and started building roads and dredging harbors? I know what we would think and I know what we would do.

We would drop an atom bomb on them before they even got the dredge unloaded. We might not drop an atom bomb on them, but we would drop some kind of a bomb on them.

The proper procedure would have been for us to ask the United Nations to protect Turkey if we thought she was in danger and then let it be known we intended to back the United Nations to the hilt.

#### GREECE

Now, let us look at Greece.

Some of my colleagues may remember that I have been utterly opposed to the whole Greek-Turkish undertaking. God knows that events have amply justified my opposition.

A few of us contended that the Greek situation should be handled through the United Nations—that truly free elections should be held under the supervision of the UN.

It was our suggestion that we provide the money we intended to appropriate for Greece to the UN to help them in carrying out a policy of genuine self-determination and rehabilitation for the Greeks. That is my contention with respect to the pending bill. But we were overruled.

Our Government resumed its old role of pulling British chestnuts out of the fire. The British were in position to keep the Greeks under control no longer and so we took over in their stead—not exactly in their stead—they have kept a few military advisers down there and to the best of my knowledge they pretty much run things in their suave British way.

I am convinced that our action in Greece has caused those people more misery, hunger, and suffering than if we had kept out of there entirely. I never was in favor of leaving the Greeks to stew in their own juice. But, I repeat, they would be better off today if we had done that.

Some people will say, "Oh, the Russians would never permit the United Nations to solve the Greek situation." How do we know? We did not ask.

The fact is pointed to that the Russians have refused to participate in the UN border watch on Greece and have vetoed several resolutions to set up border patrols.

Mr. President, having the UN handle the Greek situation in its entirety and having us go in to support a Fascist regime and then asking the UN to hold the door shut while we kicked the people around are two different things. We would be in a much stronger position if we had asked the UN to handle the Greek situation in the first instance. I know for a certainty that the UN wanted desperately to handle that affair, and I believe they could have handled it.

If Russia had tried to stop it, we could then have gone ahead with a clear conscience. As it is, we are in the position of interfering unilaterally in the affairs of a country far from our borders.

Greece and Turkey are in key positions with relation to the Dardanelles—a strategic waterway and very vital to the Soviet Union.

Suppose there were a government friendly to the Russians on the South



American shore at the very narrowest point to the outlet of the Gulf of Mexico, and suppose that outlet were much narrower—comparable to the Dardanelles—I think we would like to have a friendly government in that country in a position comparable to Turkey. Would we like it if there were a government there friendly to the Russians and the Russians came over and bolstered up that government to keep it in power?

Suppose Cuba were on the other side of those imaginary straits out of the Gulf of Mexico and suppose Cuba were in a terrible political ferment and the decision as to whether there should be a government friendly to us or to the Russians were in grave doubt. Then suppose the Russians moved into Cuba and by force of arms supported a government friendly to them. I believe we would go to war, Mr. President. I believe it is very fortunate for the peace of the world that the Russians are not prepared to go to war. Some day, of course, they will be prepared.

They are getting ready just as fast as they can and using their ideological and infiltration tactics to better advantage than we have been able to use dollars, arms, and the threat of the atomic bomb. Now we come along with the so-called Marshall plan.

We must have known that the Russians could not participate—neither could they permit their satellites to participate. This plan calls for a degree of supervision and intervention in the affairs of other nations that the Russians or any other self-respecting nation could not tolerate and would not tolerate if they had any other recourse.

#### NEW LEADERS NEEDED

So you see, Mr. President, our foreign policy has accomplished no good objective in the past, and I do not believe that it will in the future until our whole approach is completely changed.

At this late date I believe the only solution is to take the formulation and guidance of our foreign policy out of the hands of those who hate Russia and place it in the care of statesmen who genuinely desire to get along with Russia and in whose sincerity of purpose the Russians could have confidence.

I believe that the most statesmanlike utterance that has been made on the floor of the Senate during this debate was the wish and the hope expressed by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] that we might increase and expand our trade with Russia.

#### TRADE WITH RUSSIA

For a long time I have been convinced that trade with Russia would be one of the surest ways to minimize and iron out our political differences. If our moneyed interests which are so bitter against Russia and so fearful of communism should suddenly find themselves engaged in profitable commercial intercourse with Russia, I am convinced that their attitude would undergo an astonishing transformation. Today Russia is the best prospective market in the world for our manufactured goods. The Russians have gold and raw materials with which they could pay for the goods received.

There is very little prospect of any great volume of trade with other nations of the world once we quit—that is, if we ever do quit—giving nations all over the world billions of dollars with which to purchase our products. Our capitalistic economy is going to find itself in dire straits whenever we quit giving things away.

Ironically enough, I believe that Russia by her purchases from us—if we can forget our prejudices and trade with her—might be very instrumental in delaying for a considerable period of time that showdown for capitalism which they are supposed to be hopefully awaiting.

#### RUSSIA'S ACTIONS

I have had people argue with me that nothing the Russians have ever done has shown any desire to cooperate and live at peace with us, and that they are out to conquer the world. I deny that. I should like to point out that the Russians were in Manchuria and they could have stayed there if they had wanted to do so. It is a rich, populous, and vast territory. If the Russians were bent on world conquest I think they were fools to evacuate Manchuria.

To be sure, they took a great many industrial plants with them when they left, but it was their contention, and I think not without some merit, that these were Japanese-owned and therefore could rightfully be considered spoils of war.

But whether we agree with that contention or not, the fact remains that they did go home. If they were out to conquer the world, they would have been well on their way if they had chosen to remain in Manchuria.

The Russians were in Iran. Oil is very important to conquerors. There is oil in Iran.

To be sure, the Russians were a little slow in getting out. They were there, of course, as part of the war strategy; but when the matter was called to the attention of the United Nations, the Russians did go home. If they had had no regard for world opinion, or the United Nations and if they had been hell bent on conquest, I cannot feel that they would have left Iran.

#### RUSSIAN VETOS

Then, of course, there is the question of the Russian vetoes in the Security Council. The plain fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that we have an overwhelming control of the United Nations and the veto is the only weapon the Russians have. I am not trying to justify all their vetoes, by any means; but, at the same time, it is a fact we insisted on having the veto included as part of the United Nations machinery. Doubtless, we expected to use it if circumstances had been reversed. It is widely acknowledged that the UN Charter would never have been approved by the Senate had not the veto been included.

During the time the United Nations has been in existence, the Russians have used the veto 22 times. A great to-do has been made about this. I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare me a list of these vetoes and the reasons the Russians gave for using the veto. I think

it might be enlightening, if not to my colleagues, at least to those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to run through this statement, which was prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service. It was very enlightening to me; it astounded me.

Veto No. 1 occurred February 16, 1946. It was a veto of a United States proposal that, in effect, would have dismissed Soviet charges against Great Britain for having troops in Syria and Lebanon. The Russians vetoed this dismissal of the charges against Great Britain, giving as their reason disapproval of the wording of the proposal. The fact remains that the charges were pressed and Great Britain was forced to get out of Syria and Lebanon.

Veto No. 2 occurred on June 18, 1946. It was a veto of a resolution to refer the question of the Franco regime to the General Assembly. The Soviets vetoed that resolution. They maintained that the Security Council should order a world-wide break in diplomatic relations with Spain, instead of leaving the matter for the Assembly. Personally, I agree with them. Anything that can be done to embarrass Mr. Franco, I am in favor of, and I believe millions of Americans would take the same attitude.

Then on June 26, 1946, they used the veto for the third time, vetoing a British-Australian resolution to keep the Spanish question on the agenda without prejudice to the rights of the General Assembly. This was very similar to the previous veto. It was the same question, approached from a different angle. This makes two vetoes on the same question, and marks the beginning of what I believe was a western drive to discredit Russia as seeking to undermine the UN by a reckless use of the veto. I believe the western powers were equally guilty of undermining the UN by indulging in such tactics.

On June 26, 1946, came veto No. 4. It was a veto of a contention that the British-Australian resolution on the Spanish question was procedural, and therefore not subject to vote. That makes three vetoes on this one question of Spain. In using the veto this time, the Russians justified their position by quoting from the San Francisco agreement, which stated that:

The decision regarding the preliminary question as to whether or not a matter is procedural must be taken by a vote of seven members of the Security Council, including the concurring votes of permanent members.

The experts whom I have consulted assure me that the Russian contention had merit at least equal to the arguments of the proponents of the resolution.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my good friend the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not criticizing the Senator's position so far as the Russian stand in regard to Spain is concerned; but inasmuch as the pending bill is for the purpose of fighting communism, does not the Senator feel that there is a little inconsistency in the position now taken in connection with this subject?



Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly. I pointed out yesterday that the object of this bill is not to fight totalitarianism. They do not care about Peron's totalitarianism or Franco's totalitarianism. Russia's totalitarianism is all that worries them, and not because it is totalitarian, but because when countries become Communist, our big business interests can no longer go in and sell their goods and invest their capital.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Suppose I doubted the sincerity of purpose of those who would now fight communism. Is there any purpose in leaving Spain out of the picture?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not think so. If they want to fight communism, they should fight it wherever it appears.

Mr. President, veto No. 5 was on June 26, 1946, of a reintroduction of the previous resolution.

So that makes five times the Russians vetoed proposals calculated to get Franco off the hot seat. Frankly, I would have done the same.

What I want to point out is that when we kept putting the same proposition up to them over and over, the conclusion reached at least by those antagonistic to Russia was that the Russians were using the veto recklessly.

Veto No. 6 was on August 29, 1946, of a recommendation that Transjordan be admitted to the United Nations. The U. S. S. R. maintained that admission could not be recommended because it did not have diplomatic relations with Transjordan. Regardless of whether there is any validity to that argument, I should like to point out that a number of speeches were made on the floor of the Senate at the time criticizing Great Britain for seeking admission to the UN for Transjordan because its government was so completely subservient to Great Britain.

The next two vetoes are identical with the one to which I have just referred—veto No. 7, of a recommendation that Ireland be admitted to the United Nations; and veto No. 8, of a recommendation that Portugal be admitted to the United Nations. We evidently knew that the Russians would veto these two proposals, inasmuch as they were identical with the Transjordan question insofar as the nonexistence of diplomatic relations was concerned. Nevertheless, we put them forward and got those two extra vetoes—three on the same subject.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to interrupt the Senator at this point.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I am happy to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not do so for the purpose of interfering with the Senator's line of thought. But I should like to clear up our understanding of this policy of ours, if possible, even during the debate, to some extent.

Something has been made of the fact that we are fighting communism and totalitarianism throughout the world and we are sticking with our friends and we are fighting for democracy. Was there anything democratic in Portugal at the time when Portugal tried to get into the United Nations?

Mr. TAYLOR. No. Portugal is an out-and-out Fascist dictatorship.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well. Suppose we go a little further. The pending bill would take care of Eire and also Sweden. Were they in the war any more than Spain was?

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I call attention to these things merely to clear the atmosphere.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have much less objection to helping Eire and Sweden, with their democratic governments, than to helping Spain.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly so. The Senator is now talking of governments, not people, is he not?

Mr. TAYLOR. I have great sympathy for the Spanish people.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The philosophy of it is good. We are going to stick by France and those who fought with us. Is there any greater reason for helping Portugal or Sweden than there is for helping Spain?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; not a bit more, so far as I can see.

Veto No. 9 was on September 20, 1946, an American resolution calling for investigation of frontier incidents along the northern border of Greece. The Soviet Union held that no charges had been brought against Bulgaria and Yugoslavia and that to name an investigating committee would "cast a certain shadow on them" as well as on Albania.

Mr. President, why did we not ask the United Nations to take over the whole Greek question in the beginning? That is what I wanted at the time. All we want to make of the United Nations is a part-time "sweetie."

Veto No. 10 was on March 25, 1947, of a British resolution stating that the Corfu mine field could not have been laid without the knowledge of the Albanian authorities. The Soviet Union could not agree that the resolution represented the true situation in connection with the mine incident and again used the veto. I have not had time to plow through all the testimony, and I probably never shall. It is very voluminous. I have too many other things to do. It is a technical question on which I am not prepared to pass judgment or even to express an opinion. The veto was used, in any event.

Veto No. 11 was on July 29, 1947, of a United States resolution to maintain the Balkan Investigating Commission in power for two more years and to vest it with powers of conciliation as well as investigation. Russia vetoed this resolution, contending that the Security Council had no power to compel any country to admit an investigating commission and that the resolution could only create additional complications. Of course this all goes back to the fact that we had already taken unilateral action in Greece, had bypassed the United Nations, and only wanted certain actions taken when it suited our convenience.

The next three vetoes, Nos. 12, 13, and 14, are identical with 6, 7, and 8, the question of admitting Transjordan, Ireland, and Portugal to the United Nations. The Russians had once vetoed these proposals. We evidently knew they

would veto them again, but it added three more vetoes, six vetoes on one subject.

Veto No. 15 was on August 19, 1947, of a resolution introduced by Australia calling on Greece and Bulgaria, Albania and Yugoslavia to cease all acts of provocation and to enter into direct negotiations to settle the border proposal. If the United States had been included as one of the culprits in that resolution and the resolution had insisted that everybody get out and keep hands off and let the United Nations take over, then it would have been a good resolution in my opinion. As it was, Russia vetoed the resolution, which in effect was very similar to two previous resolutions calling for investigation of frontier incidents along the northern border of Greece. That makes three vetoes on one subject again.

No. 16 was on August 19, 1947, of a United States resolution fixing responsibility on Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria for Greek border difficulties and calling on these nations to cease aiding Greek guerrillas.

Well, that strikes me as the height of hypocrisy on our part when we are interfering in Greece 10,000 times more than anybody else, at least, if you judge by the money spent in interfering. The Russians vetoed the resolution, which was similar to three previous resolutions dealing with the same subject. That makes four vetoes on a similar subject, again.

Veto No. 17 was on August 21, 1947, of a resolution to recommend the admission of Italy to the United Nations. Russia contended that Italy was not eligible for membership pending ratification of peace treaty, so they vetoed the resolution. I am assured by our experts that there was sound reasoning to support the Russian veto, although the issue was certainly debatable and there was merit on both sides.

Veto No. 18 was on August 21, 1947, of a resolution to recommend admission of Austria to the United Nations, and this compilation prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service says same as veto 17—that is the one we just mentioned on the admission of Italy. So another veto was built up against Russia identical with the previous one.

Veto No. 19 was on September 15, 1947, of a United States resolution requesting the General Assembly to consider the Greek border problem and to make recommendations on its solution. U. S. S. R. contended that adoption of this resolution would be a confession of the Security Council's inability to solve the problem and an evasion of its responsibility. This resolution is a close relation of four previous resolutions which the Russians vetoed and makes five vetoes on one subject again.

Mr. President, in order to be consistent with my original stand on the question of Greece, namely, that the United Nations should have been given the whole problem, I would have vetoed all these myself until the United Nations took full charge of the whole problem of Greece, including border policing duties, and removed all outside interference. This made a total of five vetoes on the Greek question.



Veto No. 20, on September 15, 1947, was on the question as to whether the United States resolution above was procedural or substantive. Russia had vetoed similar resolutions previously and it was probably a foregone conclusion that they would veto this one which simply questioned their right to veto the resolution on the Greek border problem. But you see, Mr. President, it added one more to the number of vetoes chalked up against the Soviet Union, making six vetoes on this Greek question. All of them, of course, were given inflammatory headlines in this country.

Veto No. 21 occurred October 1, 1947, on a resolution to recommend admission of Italy to the United Nations. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics contended that it would at any time admit Italy, together with Finland, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria at one time, but would never vote for any of them separately.

I dare say, Mr. President, that Russia is as justified in seeking to have her friends admitted to the UN as is the United States or Great Britain.

On October 1, 1947, the same day as the twenty-first veto, came the twenty-second, on a resolution to recommend admission of Finland to the United Nations. The Russians did us a favor, it may appear. The notation opposite that entry in this summary prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service says, "Same as Veto 21." So by clever maneuvering, we managed to get the Russians on record with 22 vetoes.

As I say, Mr. President, when I was provided with this documentation I was astounded to find that this alarming number of vetoes concerned only four issues. And if we look at the question candidly, it would seem to me that our position in relation to these questions could well be carefully examined.

I hope the Congress never decides to put the President at a disadvantage by following this procedure. It might reduce his popularity in the same proportion that Russian prestige fell last year because of this veto question, but I am afraid the Congress would wind up in nearly as bad shape as the United Nations now finds itself. I think this whole business reeks of power politics and is a significant testimonial to the way the United Nations has been kicked around by the various nations in an effort to gain selfish advantage rather than peace for the world.

Mr. President, I should like to insert at this point in my remarks a brief documentary study of the Russian vetoes.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Use of the veto in the Security Council by the U. S. S. R.*

Date	Veto No.	Issue	Soviet-stated reason for use
Feb. 16, 1946	1	United States proposal that, in effect, would have dismissed Soviet charges against Great Britain for having troops in Syria and Lebanon.	Disapproval of the wording of the proposal.
June 18, 1946	2	Resolution to refer the question of the Franco regime in Spain to the General Assembly.	U. S. S. R. maintained that the Security Council should order a world-wide break in diplomatic relations with Spain, instead of leaving the matter for the Assembly.
June 26, 1946	3	British-Australian resolution to keep Spanish question on the agenda "without prejudice to the rights of the General Assembly."	Same as in veto 2.
Do.....	4	A contention that the British-Australian resolution on the Spanish question was procedural and therefore not subject to the veto.	U. S. S. R. vetoes this contention on the basis of a San Francisco agreement which stated that: "The decision regarding the preliminary question as to whether or not * * * a matter is procedural must be taken by a vote of 7 members of the Security Council, including the concurring votes of permanent members."
Do.....	5	Reintroduction of previous resolution [veto].....	Same as veto 4.
Aug. 29, 1946	6	Recommendation that Transjordan be admitted to the United Nations.....	U. S. S. R. maintained that admission could not be recommended because it did not have diplomatic relations with Transjordan.
Do.....	7	Recommendation that Ireland be admitted to the United Nations.....	Same as veto 6.
Do.....	8	Recommendation that Portugal be admitted to the United Nations.....	Do.
Sept. 20, 1946	9	American resolution calling for investigation of frontier incidents along the northern border of Greece.	Soviet Union held that no charges had been brought against Bulgaria and Yugoslavia and that to name an investigating committee would "cast a certain shadow on them," as well as on Albania.
Mar. 25, 1947	10	British resolution stating that the Corfu mine field could not have been laid without the knowledge of the Albanian authorities.	Soviet Union could not agree that the resolution represented the true situation in connection with the mine incident.
July 29, 1947	11	United States resolution to maintain Balkan Investigating Commission in power for 2 more years and to vest it with powers of conciliation as well as investigation.	U. S. S. R. held that the Security Council had no power to compel any country to admit an investigating commission and that the resolution could only create additional complications.
Aug. 18, 1947	12	Recommendation that Transjordan be admitted to the United Nations.....	Same as veto 6.
Do.....	13	Recommendation that Ireland be admitted to the United Nations.....	Do.
Do.....	14	Recommendation that Portugal be admitted to the United Nations.....	Do.
Aug. 19, 1947	15	Resolution introduced by Australia calling on Greece and Bulgaria, Albania, Yugoslavia "to cease all acts of provocation" and to enter into direct negotiations to settle the border problem.	U. S. S. R. contended that nothing had transpired to alter its views on the Greek situation.
Do.....	16	United States resolution fixing responsibility on Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria for Greek border difficulties and calling on these nations to cease aiding Greek guerrillas.	U. S. S. R. pointed out that if action on the Australian proposal above [veto 15] was unacceptable, then this proposal "should be considered unacceptable even to a greater degree."
Aug. 21, 1947	17	Resolution to recommend admission of Italy to the United Nations.....	Russia contended that Italy was not eligible for membership, pending ratification of peace treaty.
Do.....	18	Resolution to recommend admission of Austria to the United Nations.....	Same as veto 17.
Sept. 15, 1947	19	United States resolution requesting the General Assembly to consider the Greek border problem and make recommendations on its solution.	U. S. S. R. contended that adoption of resolution would be a confession of the Security Council of its inability to solve the problem and an evasion of its responsibility.
Do.....	20	Whether the United States resolution above was procedural or substantive.....	See veto 4.
Oct. 1, 1947	21	Resolution to recommend admission of Italy to the United Nations.....	U. S. S. R. contended that it would at any time admit Italy together with Finland, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria at one time, but would never vote for any of them separately.
Do.....	22	Resolution to recommend admission of Finland to the United Nations.....	Same as veto 21.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, the point which I have tried to bring out is this: That while the Russian use of the veto certainly caused many people to doubt seriously whether the Russians wished the United Nations to function, at the same time it seems to me that the Western Powers went out of their way to bring about situations calculated to force the Russians to use the veto.

Mr. President, let us summarize this imposing number of vetoes briefly. It boils down to this:

There were five vetoes on issues relating directly to the situation along the Greek border.

The resolution on Corfu is closely associated, making really six vetoes on this one subject.

What it amounts to is this: We had bypassed the United Nations by taking unilateral action in Greece and we were trying by parliamentary maneuvers within the Security Council to force the Russians to endorse our actions in Greece, which I have always contended were indefensible because of the fact that we were bypassing the United Nations and because of the undemocratic and collaborationist nature of the Greek Government which we were supporting.

If we reverse the circumstances and put the shoe on the other foot, we find that the reason for the very first veto was our endeavor to have dismissed charges against Great Britain for having troops in Syria and Lebanon.

In that very first issue put before the Security Council we set a pattern by trying to protect our friends.

Then, Mr. President, there were five vetoes on Spain. Frankly, I wish that our country had been on the other side of this issue and had taken the initiative in seeking concrete action against Mr. Franco. I do not believe that our position in seeking an out for this Fascist dictator has enhanced our standing among the peoples of the world as a defender of democracy.

Finally, Mr. President, there are 10 vetoes around the admission of different countries to the United Nations. On each occasion we and Britain were seeking admission for nations friendly to us and the Russians insisted that the nations seeking admission and friendly to

them be included and that all should be voted upon at one time.

Every time there was a Russian veto, the press put it in banner headlines. The headlines did not say, however, that the vetoes were so often on the same matters.

#### TERRITORIAL EXPANSION

I come now to the question of territorial expansion. A great deal has been made of who has been expanding, and where. The question has been raised as to whether the Russians' behavior is proof that they want to engulf the world.

I do not believe it can properly be said that the Russians expanded when they regained territories which hostile powers had separated from them by armed invasion. However, it cannot be denied that the Russians have now included several other nations in their sphere of influence, not by direct military action, perhaps, but by techniques of ideological infiltration in much the same way that we use dollar diplomacy.

In accordance with an agreement with Great Britain to which I have previously referred, governments friendly toward Russia were established in Rumania and Bulgaria.

In direct contravention of that agreement, Yugoslavia, which was to be in the British sphere of influence, failed to behave according to Churchill's plan and it set up a government friendly to Russia.

Czechoslovakia now has a Communist government and is in the Russian sphere, but it was in the Russian sphere before the change of government.

At any rate the Russians are not alone in their expansion of their spheres of influence.

Despite our protestations that we do not want any territory, we have taken possession of a number of Pacific islands without anyone's permission but simply by informing the United Nations we were going to do it.

We are firmly established in Okinawa. Japan is certainly under our influence. We occupy half of Korea.

Turkey has come under our domination to a large extent. We are in Greece with armaments and increasing numbers of military personnel.

We are in China at least as much as are the Russians.

We are exploiting the oil of Iran and have a military mission and a sizable economic mission there.

We are still in Greenland despite the vigorous protests of Denmark.

We are establishing air bases in north Africa.

Arabia would certainly be classified as being under our sphere of influence.

We have aided and abetted the Dutch in their nefarious subversion of Indonesian freedom, and we have furnished the military supplies that enabled the French to reestablish themselves in Indo-China.

The western zone of Germany is under our domination, as the eastern zone is under Soviet domination.

The question of who has expanded the farthest from home, of which power is closer to the frontiers of the other, can be easily settled by taking a tape measure and a globe and measuring from the borders of the United States and likewise

from the borders of the U. S. S. R. to the farthest point of each country's occupation or domination.

Another good comparison is to measure from the farthest point of the other country's domination, for instance, from Yugoslavia at the present moment to the United States, and from our German zone or from our Korean zone to Russian territory, and then easily establish which country is closest to the homeland of the other.

I contend that we are at least equally guilty in the matter of expansion.

#### RUSSIANS NOT GANGSTERS

One more point, Mr. President, in this argument as to whether the Russians are the only menace to peace in the world. I have heard people say that we cannot deal with the Russians because their leaders are gangsters and tyrants. I cannot agree with that premise. I never heard of tyrants who worked long hours to improve the economic condition of their subjects.

This seems to be one of the most serious complaints that Mr. Kravchenko has to make against Russia in his book *I Choose Freedom*. Mr. Kravchenko, a former Russian official, complains at length over the fact that Russian Government executives must work long hours trying to make their economy work ever better and thereby raise the standard of living of the Russian people.

The Russians have improved the living standards of their people to an unprecedented degree in a very brief period of time. I have read in the press recently that their progress in the last year has been phenomenal. The Russians spend more money for education than any other nation in the world. I never heard of a gangster or a tyrant educating the people they intended to exploit. It is contended, of course, that they do not truly educate their people because they fill them full of Communist propaganda.

#### AMERICA IS BEST

I got quite a bit of pro-American propaganda along with my schooling. I think it is only natural and proper that a nation should bring up their young to believe that their country is the best in the world. As I said, I was taught to believe that, and the older I grow the more I become convinced that this is by far the best country on earth.

That is why I am arguing here today, Mr. President, that the Russians are not so bad as they have been painted, that it is possible to get along with Russia. In trying to point out that the Russians are not all bad I am aware that I am laying myself open to what I know will be a campaign of vilification which will certainly be hard to stand up under. If I did not love my country, if I were willing to see it destroyed, I would skip the whole thing.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I stated yesterday, and I repeat, I want the American people to have freedom of expression, and so

far as I am concerned, the fact that the Senator might be running for a political office, the fact that he might have some views different from my own, does not make me feel that he is not just as good a Senator as sits in the United States Senate.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. I am only sorry to say that his belief that every man in this country has a right to say what he thinks, and even think what he thinks, is not shared by many people, and the freedoms which we have considered to be traditionally American are becoming severely circumscribed. I am afraid that if the trend is not stopped, we shall be in a very sad state, so far as our civil liberties are concerned.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. It is not necessary for the Senator from Idaho to have testimonials as to his patriotism and Americanism, but I wish to say that I do not want the moment to pass without attesting that I subscribe to every word and sentiment just expressed so well by the Senator from New Mexico. In my opinion there is not a better American in the United States Senate, or in America, than the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the Senator from Florida sincerely, from the bottom of my heart. He knows the high regard I have for him without my saying it.

Mr. President, if we admit that Russia is as bad as so many among us seem to think she is, we might as well give up and prepare for atomic war, and we are told that would mean we might just as well go out and dig graves for ourselves and our families. I am not prepared to do that, regardless of the consequences to myself. While there is life, there is hope.

Mr. President, to admit that the Russians are as bad as they have been painted would leave but one alternative—a show-down fight, which the experts say would mean not only the end of Russia, but the end of us—the end of civilization, and probably the extermination of all life on this planet.

#### FOR LOVE OF COUNTRY

I am making this presentation and inviting the violent abuse that will probably be heaped upon me as being pro-Russian because I love my country and its people. I shall go beyond that, and say that I love all people everywhere. If I did not love my country, if I did not place the welfare of its people above my own welfare, quite frankly, I would be on the other side of this argument. I would join in the brave, breast-beating against Russia, because, Mr. President, the handwriting is clear on the wall. It will take something little short of a miracle to push us back from the brink of destruction where we stand at the present moment.

I know full well that if we become engaged in this conflict, if war comes to this continent as it surely will this time, there will be a great wave of hysteria and



a search for goats to sacrifice to appease the wrath of the people. I am convinced that, if that comes to pass, I will indeed be fortunate if I do not wind up behind the barbed wire of a concentration camp. Indeed, my life may well be forfeit for the stand I am taking here today.

If I were easily terrified, frankly, I would turn my back on what to some may seem a hopeless struggle to preserve sanity in this world, and make my peace with those who will be shouting "We were right!" should war break out. I cannot do that. For the sake of my wife and children, I almost wish I could. But it is not that simple, really. We cannot save ourselves by hiding in the mob and joining in the clamor because in another war the mob will be destroyed—all of us.

#### ONLY COURSE

Frankly, this is the only course I see open to me that presents the faintest avenue—the slightest gleam of hope—for the survival of those I love and those many others who trust and believe in me. I believe it is not too late to change the course of events and reestablish understanding between ourselves and the Russians. I believe it, if for no other reason than that to believe otherwise is to adopt the fatalistic Chinese attitude and prepare for the inevitable end.

We cannot make this change for the better with a President who has made plain his hatred of Russia. We cannot reverse the grim march of events with the present Congress when so many of its Members have tried to see who could outdo the other in stirring up the hatred of the people against Russia.

I believe these conditions will be changed. I have unbounded confidence in the good judgment of the American people.

I shall continue fighting for peace because unless peace is preserved there well may be no life; and without life certainly there is no hope.

While I cannot bring myself to the faith in nonviolence of Mahatma Gandhi, I would like to point out that, by faith and individual effort, with no finances, no armies, and no violence, Gandhi conquered the British Empire and won freedom for his people.

I am no pacifist; no advocate of peace at any price. I do not believe in appeasing any nation. As David Lawrence pointed out in his column a few days ago, a great and powerful nation such as ours cannot appease a weak nation such as Russia. We could be magnanimous and try to find some solution, but it remains for the weak to appease the strong.

I refuse to resign myself or my people to atomic destruction until every other recourse is exhausted. Until one real and honest effort has been made to reach an understanding with the Russians—when a sincere attempt at peaceful cooperation has been made and failed—there is time then for this grand final gesture of dying gloriously.

When I put myself in the place of the Russians, I can see why they have many reasons to mistrust and fear us and our intentions. But it is quite possible that only an expression from the American people demanding that an all-out, sincere effort be made to rescue the United

Nations and to convince the Russians that we have no designs against them, is the only thing that will save the world from destruction. I have confidence that the American people will deliver such a mandate at the first opportunity.

Mr. President, I have introduced a bill in the nature of a substitute for the measure now under consideration. It has been printed and is on the desks of Senators.

I should like to discuss both measures for comparative purposes.

I shall take up the bipartisan measure first.

There is not a great deal I have to say about this so-called Economic Cooperation Act of 1948. When I told my wife the other day that the name had been changed, and now it was E. C. A.—ECA—she asked, "What does that stand for? European Corporation of America?" I think that would be a good name for it, Mr. President.

It will create a host of new bureaucrats, some of whom will have almost kingly power over the lives of people in foreign countries.

They will have power to guarantee investments, presumably, of course, on a basis of the necessity of the project to the success of our plans.

In the past it has all too often turned out that friends and business associates profit from such arrangement.

Although I am not a lawyer, it seems to me that the strings attached to our help are more embarrassing and the compliance requirements more stringent than when our Federal Government grants aid to our States here at home.

I have been trying to find out just what this Marshall plan, ERP, BERP, or ECA is all about. I have been wading through the mountain of stuff the Government committees have gotten out and I have read some of the testimony, obviously not all of it, for it was presented to us the first of this week.

Most of the witnesses seem to talk all around the plan, but they never quite let us in on what it does.

They tell how much we need to help Europe—but never just how much this plan really does help Europe.

I think I have now figured out what the plan is all about and how it works, what it is going to mean for us and for the French or Italian farmer and worker and his family.

Western Europe is like a bottom-land farmer who has been hit by a flash flood. His fields have been flooded, his barn washed away, his machines rusted, most of his cattle drowned, the food in his cellar spoiled by the spring flood coming down the river. He is really in bad shape. And most of the other fellows living near him are in the same shape. So they go to the banker in the next town and ask for help, for a loan to buy flour and seed and the machines they need to get back on their feet again. The banker calls in one of the farmers, Ernie we might call him, and says:

"Ernie, I'll be glad to lend you money. You have a good reputation with all the merchants in town and you've always been a good risk. And besides you and most of the other boys are in the same church that we belong to."

"But you know, Ernie," says the banker, "this is a big thing. We get these floods every couple of years and we've got to do something about that river besides just helping you boys get over this year's trouble."

"You know, even while the flood was on the board of directors of the bank met and we decided we ought to get everybody in town to pitch in and help out. We're putting on a big show for your benefit. Everybody is donating something and promises to help out. In the meantime, why don't you get together with all the other fellows on your side of the river and draw up a careful estimate of what you all need to get back into production."

Ernie thinks that is a good idea. So he goes home and talks it over with his wife, and she thinks it is a good idea, too. So they start calling all the other farmers on their side of the river to get together and draw up an estimate of what they all need so they can submit it to the banker.

But Ernie's wife suddenly says: "Ernie, what about the farmers on the other side of the river? They're worse off than we are, and if we do anything on this side, they'll have to do something on the other side or it won't do any of us any good. Besides we do quite a little horse trading with them. And some of them are my kinsfolk."

Ernie, who has never liked the boys on the other side of the river, especially his wife's family, reluctantly agrees it might be a good idea to invite the fellows on the other side of the river. But he remembers the banker told him to invite just the boys on his side of the river. So he asks the banker about it.

The banker says, "Well, go ahead and invite them, but you might tell them we're going to have some drastic changes in the way they run their farms if they want to join up with us on this thing."

So Ernie invites them and tells them what they are going to have to do. When they hear of some of these intended changes, they walk out, which makes Ernie feel just fine, because he never liked them anyway.

So Ernie and all the boys on his side of the river get together. They sit around a while figuring how little they can get along on and must borrow from the banker. We will call the banker Harry. So a couple of weeks later in they all come to see Harry, the banker. Ernie brings his wife along, because she has always been the manager in their home.

The banker, Harry, takes a look at their estimate and goes into a huddle with his board of directors, which includes all the businessmen in town. Then he calls Ernie and Henri and Rocco and all the other boys in and tells them, "Fine, boys. We've cut your figures here and there a little, but they looked good to us. This looks like a real job. Now there are only a couple of things to do before you all sign up for your loans."

Then Harry begins to tell them about the conditions of the loan.

By this time the boys and their families are pretty desperate; things are get-

ting tougher. They are not in the mood to bargain or argue much.

Harry says, "First, boys, we're not going to be able to let you have all the seed you need, and we'll have to cut down on any tractors. Ernie can't have that hay baler, and Henri can't get that manure spreader, and Rocco can't have that plow, and it looks as though we won't be able to let any of you have any of the milking machines."

"You see," says Harry, "we're sending the tractors and the seed and the plows and the milking machines over to Heinz over there, the guy who lets his pigs through your fences to run all over your cornfield every couple of years to fatten them up free of charge. He's in a bad way, but it looks like he can get back on his feet faster than any of you other fellows."

"But don't worry," says Harry, "we've got some flour ready for you and we've got some cases of bran flakes for your families. And I'll tell you what—we'll let you have some new oil burners."

"We just got in a shipment straight from the East, from a factory I have an interest in, best little oil burners you ever saw. Once you put these in, none of you will have to go out and cut wood for your stoves, and we'll be able to send in oil trucks regularly so you can buy oil from us."

"Now, let's see," said the banker, "this isn't just a matter of tiding you boys over the next harvest. It's a big plan so you can get out of debt and get back on your feet in four years. It looks to me like you'll have to sell more milk and raise more wheat for sale. You won't be able to keep any of that wheat for seed. And you'd better cut down on your kitchen gardens for the next couple of years and stick to raising the things you can sell. You'll have to sell all your milk and butter in town. Besides you can buy canned food, anyway."

So Ernie says, "Well, I guess that's all right but we could help ourselves out a bit by trading with the boys across the river—they will grow good vegetables as soon as they can get some cultivators and clear the muck off their land."

But Harry has an answer to that. He says, "Sure, go ahead and trade with them, but you cannot help them clear the muck off and you cannot sell them anything we send you even if they can use it better than you—and we are going to make mighty certain they will not be able to buy any of these things from us here in town."

That is all right by Ernie, but his wife starts to do a little figuring. Without the milking machines and the tractor and the cultivator, that means the kids and she will have to work night and day; the kids will not be able to go back to school. And without the food from across the river, that means they are not going to get as much to eat.

"And then, what about repaying the loan?" Ernie asks the banker.

"Oh, that is all right," says Harry. "We know it will take a long time to pay this, so we have worked out a long-term arrangement. We will let you have most of the things you need free out of donations by the people who work here in town and the rest you can pay for by

building a special crib on your farm and putting aside a part of your crop or some of your butter every month for us."

"And what do we do with the stuff we put aside that way?" asks Ernie.

"Well," says Harry, "we have not quite figured that out. We do not want it in town here—it might make prices drop. But maybe some of the merchants who will be selling you things can come in and take it—or swap it for a partnership with you. We have not got that quite figured out. Anyway, you will not have to worry about it."

"Oh, and there is something else," says Harry.

"After all, this is a kind of new idea. We have got to see that it works right, so we are sending a man to live with you to see that everything is done right, and that you do not waste the stuff we are sending you."

"He will keep a record of everything we send you and he will see to it that you do not trade with the boys across the river, and that you put aside the right amount to keep up payments to us."

"We will just move him right in and he can live with your family."

"Looks like you will have to give up your bedroom for a while."

"Be sure to feed him well. He is our agent, and he will tell you just exactly what you have got to do every day."

Ernie begins to scratch his head at that idea.

But that is not all. The banker then goes on to say, "Of course, we will take a mortgage on your farm and your house and your cattle."

Ernie's wife pipes up just then and says, "And how long do you think we will take to start paying off the mortgage and getting out of debt?"

"Oh," says the banker, "by the end of 4 years, you'll be just a little worse off—we figure 10 percent worse off—than you were in 1938."

"Yes," thinks Ernie's wife, "that's the year two of the boys had to be kept out of school because we couldn't buy shoes and we couldn't afford a doctor for me when I was sick."

Ernie is a little puzzled by this generosity. But Harry has a couple of other little strings in his pocket.

"In the first place," says Harry, "we want to see you boys on this side of the river form yourselves into a little association for your own protection against the boys on the other side of the river."

"What for?" speaks up the missus.

"Well, you never can tell," says Harry. "They're a bad crew over there. It's true they're worse off than you are, but they're up to no good. And we've got to protect ourselves. So we're forming a little protective association."

"And," he adds, "we've already made Heinz treasurer of the association because he's got a bigger farm and he's getting a bigger loan from us."

By this time Ernie is in no position to argue. Of course, he remembers that Heinz came over one time and mistreated his daughter. He let his stock overrun the farm, and one thing and another; but Ernie is in no position to talk back. He needs that sack of flour and a hoe—since he cannot get a tractor and cultivator to replace his old one—and a

couple of cords of wood—or rather, the oil burner. Besides, he never liked the fellows across the river anyway. So he agrees.

But just as he is ready to sign on the dotted line, the banker leans over, pats him on the back and says, "Oh, by the way, there's one other thing. You know, I have some farm lands myself, the other side of town. My farms also turn out butter and wheat and cattle. I sell my stuff right here in town, so you boys will have to market your stuff somewhere else, not in this town."

Just then Ernie's missus, who has been sitting there all this time pretty quiet, pipes up and says, "By the way, Harry, what do we need that new protective association for when we have that big new United Neighbors Cooperative that we set up right after the last flood? Everybody on both sides of the river belongs to it, except for Heinz and a couple of others who won't act neighborlike. We were getting all set to build a dam and dikes on both sides of the river to hold the floodwaters. We can't build a dike just on our side of the river. Whatever's going to happen to that big co-op which we all joined to build that dike? You're a member, too, you know."

"Oh, you mean that big United Neighbors Co-op," says Harry. "That's just window dressing. That's no good for our kind of people."

By this time Ernie is so weary of all these conditions that he is in no shape to say anything more. So he signs the mortgage and the agreement—and despite the fact that they have to form a new protective association, each farmer has to sign a separate agreement with the bank.

Just as Ernie is going out the door of the bank with a slip to get a sack of flour, a hoe, and the oil burner the banker calls out to him:

"Oh, Ernie, by the way, there's just one other thing. I'm afraid you're going to have to divorce your wife. She's a Red. She wants to work with these people across the river in that big United Neighbors Co-op. She's not our kind."

Mr. President, that is the Marshall plan, ERP, BERP, or whatever we choose to call it. What we are telling the people of Europe is that they cannot have the machines they need to rebuild their industry, but they must export more anyway.

We tell them that they cannot have as much food as they will need, but we will send them plenty of tobacco.

We call this a recovery program, but admit that at the end of it they will be 10 percent worse off than in 1938. We tell them they can trade with eastern Europe, but we make it impossible for them to do so except by bootleg trade between the two areas.

Instead of lending money to Poland or returning Yugoslavia's gold so they can produce more coal and grain for western Europe, we shall be shipping the coal and grain to Europe. We are making Europe convert to oil burners so that our Standard Oil and Texaco concessions in the Middle East can make more money selling oil to Europe. We tie them up in such tight controls that they cannot breathe without calling on the American



administrator. They cannot export or import without getting his permission. We demand a separate plan and agreement for each country. We make them adhere to our ideas on currency, credits, and tariffs. We make them open up their industries to American monopolies.

Our administrator will have supreme control over growing blocks of their currency which he can use in any way he wishes, to buy out control of their industries, to cause inflation or deflation, or to help favorite sons.

What happens at the end of 4 years? The experts themselves admit that at the end of this 4-year program, Europe will be eating less than it did in 1938. As for recovery, by limiting the kinds of goods we are sending them, we are indefinitely postponing recovery.

At the same time, we are doing the reverse for Germany.

We are sending Germany more machines and capital goods and helping to rebuild Germany as the center of a western federation which we are forcing down the throats of the people she devastated.

American big business moves into western Europe and can take over control, lock, stock, and barrel. All we ask is that they join us in fighting the cold war.

Earlier I pointed out that the people wanted and still want this program to be administered through the United Nations.

I was very happy to find the United Nations mentioned on page 2, and again on page 34, where there are three brief paragraphs devoted to the United Nations.

I am glad the paragraphs are devoted to the United Nations, inasmuch as there are very few in high places who are devoted to the United Nations.

The bill provides that the President is authorized to request the cooperation of or the use of the services and facilities of the United Nations. The United Nations enters into the picture in a positive way not at all.

Oh, yes, we will send the United Nations copies of our report to Congress on the operations conducted under this act and will send them copies of agreements concluded by the United States and participating countries if such registration is required by the Charter of the United Nations. We are not going to give the United Nations anything we do not have to.

That is all for the United Nations.

The bill calls for the creation of an advisory committee to be paid on a day-to-day basis, which means, of course, that the membership will have to be people of independent means, free to come and go and not be encumbered with the embarrassing necessity of holding down a regular job. That will insure that they are from the upper crust.

The bill establishes another joint congressional committee. That will mean another chairman's job and another committee staff. We will beat the Reorganization Act yet. It is already in almost as bad shape as the United Nations. That is very desirable, of course.

What I should like to point out particularly about this bill is the use of fine language and phrases in the declaration

of policy, such as "the restoration or maintenance in European countries of principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence" and "it is declared to be the policy of the United States to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions and genuine independence."

As I have said, Mr. President, these are fine, high-sounding phrases; but how well do they stand up when we look at the actual operation of the Truman doctrine abroad?

Frankly, Mr. President, as I have previously stated, I do not believe that anyone truly thinks that this program is going to be any different in operation than the so-called assistance we have been giving to foreign nations up to now.

So let us see how we sustain and strengthen the principles of individual liberty and free institutions when we move in.

In the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, March 8, there was an article, almost a full column in length, written by Homer Bigart from Athens. It begins like this:

Nicholas Kolyvas, former Minister of Justice, said today that the current wave of mass arrests, deportations, and executions was the result of the Greek Government's interpretation of the Truman doctrine. It believes, he said, that Washington desires ruthless suppression of the left as an implementation of President Truman's containment of communism theme.

Mr. President, for many months I have seen accounts in our press, with monotonous regularity, stating that 30, 40, or 50 Greeks had been shot that day—not killed in battle, Mr. President, but lined up and shot because they did not agree and see eye to eye with the government that is presently in power in Greece. That government, which we are supporting, Mr. President, is under the domination of people who collaborated with the Nazis—stooges of Adolf Hitler. The people who are being killed by hundreds, yes, by thousands, are the ones who fought against Hitler's occupation.

To return to Mr. Kolyvas, the former Greek Minister of Justice, he has this to say:

"I suppose I'll be labeled a Communist and a traitor for saying this, but I believe these convictions should have been reviewed."

Poor Kolyvas. He will be next.

I read further:

"Remember, some of these crimes were committed in a period of extreme political upheaval and at a time when both British and American broadcasts were urging the EAM to neutralize and repress all elements collaborating with the Germans."

In other words, the government we are supporting in Greece is now shooting the people who fought against them when they were governing for Adolf Hitler.

Mr. Bigart has this to say about the present government, or rather he is still quoting Mr. Kolyvas, and he says:

In the matter of individual freedom, the coalition government of Liberals and Populists—

Of course, the Populists are the Royalists—

this government created last September by Loy W. Henderson, State Department Di-

rector of Near Eastern and African Affairs, has proved far more repressive than even the predominantly rightist governments which preceded it, Mr. Kolyvas maintained. He said thousands of suspected leftists have been deported without trial, journalists arrested for criticizing the government, and civil servants purged for disloyalty without benefit of the right of appeal.

Of course, Mr. President, we shall not let the last item, the one about the dismissal of civil servants without the right of appeal, bother us too much. We are in the same boat here at home. I wonder if the perpetrators of our bipartisan foreign policy are using Greece as an experimental laboratory to see just how far you can go in kicking people around, with an eye to applying the lesson learned here at home later on.

Also, I should like to refer back to this person, Loy W. Henderson. It seems that he is the ringleader in the nefarious scheme to have us back down from our stand on Palestine. Also, I understand, Mr. President, that a Vice President does not have a great deal to do, so I hope I shall be allowed the pleasure, after January 20, 1949, of personally carrying to Mr. Henderson a note saying, "Loy, we disaffiliate."

Just below the article to which I have been referring is another, the heading of which is: "Van Fleet escapes blast plot."

It seems, Mr. President, that the top military man we have in Greece, Maj. Gen. James A. Van Fleet, narrowly missed being blown up.

One of these days somebody is going to get blown up—someone important. What shall we do then, Mr. President?

Below that article is another one with this heading: "Turkey wants United States aid to take economic form."

The article points out, strangely enough, that the Turks, who have always been known as more or less bloodthirsty fellows, feel that we are sending them too many guns, and they would like to have something to eat and wear, if we do not mind.

Let us read from the dispatch:

Ankara sources who cannot be quoted said that the military aid program was drawn up in haste. They said the general staff had no time to consider all the aspects of the program suggested by the first American mission.

At the time when aid to Turkey was first proposed, Mr. President, I heard stories to the effect that the Turks did not want any aid; that we practically had to threaten them in order to make them accept any aid at all. This dispatch would seem to bear these stories out, because it speaks of the program suggested by the first American mission. We just made them take it, Mr. President. We are making everyone take something. Perhaps they do not have enough money with which to buy it; but by heavens, someone must take it.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to quote from an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Saturday, March 6, 1948, to further bolster my contention that the bipartisan coalition is absolutely insincere in its protestations that we are seeking to spread democracy all over the world.

But first let us understand that the Herald Tribune is supporting the ERP—or the Marshall plan or ECA or whatever we call it. They have not yet come to the realization that what they are supporting is just some more of what they are condemning in this editorial. The editorial has this to say:

At the same time that the information division of the American aid mission—

That is the one in Greece—

was reassuring the world to the effect that the Greek press enjoys as real a freedom as that existing in the United States, two Athens editors were being jailed for expressing criticism of a type that could never have been questioned in this country, even in wartime. These editors, who are Socialists (but anti-Communists) had attacked the government for executing political prisoners who had been in jail since 1944. The crimes they were accused of had been committed against the German Nazi and Italian Fascist occupation forces. Since they had been in jail for more than 3 years they could obviously have had no part in the recent and current guerrilla activities.

Imagine that, Mr. President. Those poor devils had been in jail since 1944. They were thrown in jail by Hitler's and Mussolini's boys, for crimes they had committed against the occupation. In other words, they were patriots. But now the Greek Government which we are supporting over there takes those poor fellows out of jail—that is to say, the ones who are still alive—and shoots them.

I read further:

The reasons given for their execution at this time are hardly flattering to the United States. During the period when the British were advising the Greeks, it was felt that the death sentences would not be carried out because of the likelihood of unfavorable reaction by British public opinion and the British Labor Government. Now that the British have been replaced by the Americans, this consideration apparently no longer holds.

So they take the boys out and shoot them.

Do you not think, Mr. President, that we are just a little off base when we criticize what goes on in any other country while these things are happening in Greece? Do you not think we are just a little bit hypocritical when, in writing a bill which will enable us to carry our Greek-Turkish program to other countries, we put in words and phrases, such as these, which I quote from the bill we are considering?

To sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions.

I cannot and I will not vote to inflict on other people the sad fate that has overtaken the Greeks since we set out to teach them about democracy.

Mr. President, are the American people and the American mission in Greece condoning brutality and murder, or are they not? Where is there an American note to Greece like the one our State Department sent to Czechoslovakia last week? And where, incidentally, is the British Labor Government, and what is it doing about Greece? Which American spokesmen for the Truman doctrine and its successor, the Marshall plan, have spoken

out in the name of this Government against what is happening in Greece? We have an American economic mission in Greece. We have an American military mission there too, guiding and instructing the Greek Army, which is responsible for arrests and executions. We have an American Ambassador in Greece. We have just sent over another top American general. Do you think for a moment, Mr. President, that the arrests and executions could be possible unless the American Government representatives approved them?

In contrast to the bill before us, which I believe is a wasteful and war-breeding continuation of the Truman doctrine, I have presented a bill which is on the desks of the Senators. It embodies the Wallace-Taylor program for genuine foreign aid through the United Nations. It calls for a halt to the cold-war hysteria of the Truman doctrine and proposes immediate steps toward world disarmament.

While we are on the subject of the cold war, Mr. President, I should like to digress to call the attention of the Senate to an article which appeared in the United States News World Report, on March 5, 1948. The heading reads as follows:

Rejection of Russian feelers—Truman decision to fight on.

To leave the United States News article for a moment, it would seem that Mr. Truman is a great "fighter-on-er." I see that he has just announced that he intends to fight on, on another front here at home.

The United States News article has this to say:

Czech coup as aftermath of United States refusal to meet.

In other words, Russia wanted to talk things over. Hard-boiled Harry refused, and Czechoslovakia was the goat.

Let us follow the United States News a little further:

Premier Stalin proposed, was turned down on a Truman meeting.

You will note, Mr. President, that there is no equivocation about these statements. David Lawrence, the editor of the United States News, is not one to make such flat statements unless he can back them up.

To continue:

United States decision is to go on with cold war, to try to win back gains Russia makes in Europe.

I digress here, Mr. President, to say that that, in my opinion, is absolutely asinine. Unless we are prepared to use everything we have, right down to the atom bomb, we are not going to win back any gains that Russia has made or may make. The only sensible thing to do is to get together, end the cold war, and make a serious and sincere effort at co-operation. I do not believe that will be done so long as we have a Government so completely under the domination of big business and the military.

The News article has this to say about the matter:

Now moves are expected as Mr. Stalin, rebuffed, goes along with plans to shove United States out of Europe and nail down victory.

United States isn't doing so well in getting the world straightened out, isn't making expected gains.

I imagine there were those who expected gains from the Truman doctrine as applied in Greece and Turkey, and who expect gains from the extension of that doctrine under the name of ECA. I did not expect gains at the time of the Greek episode. I voted against it. I knew that no good could come from bypassing the United Nations. I do not expect gains from the new adventure we are considering except financial gains for the big business interests that will be running this program.

The article goes on to say unequivocally that the Russians asked for a conference looking toward the ending of the cold war. Mr. Truman said he would not go to Russia. Stalin offered to meet him in Stockholm. Truman said no, he would not go any place; that if Joe wanted to meet him, he would have to come to the White House. If we are not absolutely determined to carry the cold war to its hot conclusion, why did we not suggest a meeting in Cuba. The President spent the last 2 weeks down there fooling around.

However, if the President has a dread of meeting Mr. Stalin except on his own doorstep, I have a suggestion to make. Let us just saw off the balcony, put it on a warship, haul it out in the ocean some place and let them talk things over, sitting on Harry's balcony. If any good came of such a meeting, that would be the best suggestion I have heard of for getting our money's worth out of this piece of second-story work. In such a setting the event would make great headlines. In fact, its fame might be so great that the episode of Romeo and Juliet would be erased as the top balcony incident.

The News article points out that Finland and Italy may be the next to pay the price of Mr. Truman's well-known mulishness. It also says that Austria is very wobbly, and we all know that France can just as easily go one way as the other. The conclusions drawn by the United States News are these:

Shooting war, however, remains improbable. The United States does not start shooting and is not likely to start shooting because of knowledge that shooting would lead to Russian troops pouring out over all of Europe and much of Asia.

I agree that the Russian troops would fan right out if we were to start a shooting war. I am sorry I am not so complacent as the United States News appears to be when they say we are not going to start a shooting war. I will agree with the last part of the sentence quoted, Mr. President, but as to our not starting a shooting war, I am not so sure. After all, the same man is still in the White House, who, against the advice of most of America's scientists, ordered the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima. There is not much telling what he might do.

He is in a very precarious position politically. Frankly, I would have to have a lot to boot to trade my political prospects for his right now. When the new party really gets up steam, there is no telling what might happen. There



are some people who would rather have an atomic bomb dropped on them than to see Henry Wallace elected President. So I think we do have to worry a great deal about whether or not we will start a shooting war.

The News article goes on to say:

Russia does not start shooting for several reasons. One is that she is unable to get at the United States directly unless in a sneak attack. Another is that she fears the effect of an atomic-bomb attack when she is unable to hit back in kind. A third reason is that Russian industry is weak and the Russian people tired.

I agree with those conclusions, Mr. President.

Then the News article winds up in this way:

At some stage short of a shooting war one side or the other may tire of the fight and offer to talk when the other side too is in the mood to talk. If not, then the irritations that are building in a cold war eventually are to end in shooting war. Mr. Truman showed that he is not yet ready to talk.

I shall put this postscript on it; I do not believe it makes much difference whether Mr. Truman is ready to talk or not.

If we can prevent him issuing the orders for another Hiroshima until after the next election, I believe there will be a man in the White House in whom the Russians would have confidence and who could settle this matter very satisfactorily and honorably to everyone concerned.

But, Mr. President, I got away from the subject in hand, which was a brief description of the foreign aid bill I have introduced. My bill simply recognizes that we had better turn back to the United Nations now if we do not want war. The bipartisan Truman doctrine and the ECA would bypass the United Nations permanently, divide the world, and lead to war. My bill is based squarely on the Charter of the United Nations, which is the last best hope for peace. It will maintain these through international cooperation. It will provide real economic aid without intervention and interference with the right of nations to self-determination.

I believe the bill before us is doomed to certain failure.

It will weaken and distort the European economy at tremendous cost to this country, and it will result in American big business grabbing control of European industry.

Right here I should like to say that I am not seeking, neither shall I try, to weaken the measure which is now being considered. As I have said, I expect it to pass. I shall cooperate with the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan to try to make the bill the best bill possible. I think it will fail, but it will fail without my trying to hamstring it. I do not want that responsibility placed upon me.

My bill, "the peace and reconstruction act of 1948," provides that the United States shall take the lead through a \$5,000,000,000 contribution in setting up within the United Nations a Reconstruction and Economic Development Administration for Europe with contributions from all nations.

It provides for an emergency program to help Europe with food, fuel, and materials until the machinery of the United Nations Reconstruction Administration is ready to operate.

It would set up an ever-normal world food granary within the United Nations to assure a constant and continuing market for everything American farmers and all other farmers can produce and provide food for hungry peoples everywhere.

It would bar the use of the United Nations Reconstruction Fund for any military expenditures.

Money would be made available to all European nations in need without political strings, after each country had obtained approval of its own plan from the United Nations Reconstruction Administration.

My bill would permit universal disarmament to prevent war.

Mr. President, I believe a foreign policy for peace must look forward eventually to cutting military expenditures to 10 percent of the current rate if we are to stop the wasteful spending of an ever-increasing part of our budget in a hopeless arms race and save ourselves from becoming a totalitarian military state.

My bill is a bill for peace and reconstruction. The Truman doctrine in ECA is a bill that prepares for war and puts Europe on a permanent dole.

If the American people could choose freely, they would choose for peace, not war; for genuine reconstruction, not permanent poverty. I am convinced they will choose our way in November.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The able Senator from Idaho has submitted a substitute bill, and of course he is entitled to a vote upon it. Under the rules a substitute cannot be voted upon until all amendments which are pending shall be disposed of. I think it would be logical to vote upon the substitute at this time. I therefore submit the following unanimous consent proposal:

I ask that the rule be suspended, that the substitute submitted by the able Senator from Idaho be immediately presented to the Senate, and that without amendment or further debate the Senate shall proceed by yeas-and-nays vote to vote upon it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico objects.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wished to propound a parliamentary inquiry, but I shall wait until the Senator has concluded.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I know the Senator from New Mexico shares my desire to proceed to a conclusion with reference to this situation. Certainly there could be no fairer time to vote on the substitute offered by the able Senator from Idaho than at the conclusion of his address. I am not even ask-

ing for an opportunity to discuss his substitute. I think it will greatly facilitate the proceedings, and it would be highly logical, if the vote should occur immediately following the Senator's address. I think he is in agreement with the suggestion, and I very earnestly request my friend from New Mexico to permit us to proceed in that fashion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have noticed that there were very few Senators present and listening to the Senator from Idaho when he delivered his interesting address, and I am sure that the Senators are so much interested in doing the right thing that they would prefer at least to read in the RECORD the remarks of the Senator from Idaho. Notwithstanding my great desire to cooperate with the Senator from Michigan and conclude the proceedings in connection with the subject with as little delay as possible, I think Senators should have an opportunity to read in the RECORD the remarks of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I submit another unanimous-consent request. I ask that when the Senate convenes at noon tomorrow, the substitute offered by the Senator from Idaho shall be submitted to the Senate, and that without amendment or further debate at that time the Senate shall proceed to vote by yeas-and-nays vote upon the substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire whether or not there is an amendment to the original committee bill pending at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the present time there is no amendment to the original bill pending.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then, I should like to know of any rule which prevents an immediate vote on the substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair there is nothing that would prevent the substitute being voted on at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Under my construction of the rules, Mr. President, if a substitute has been offered and is pending, and there is no amendment to the original bill pending, the Senate must vote on the substitute, and there is no reason on earth for avoiding a vote on the substitute which has been submitted and is now pending. There is no amendment to the original bill pending, and there is no parliamentary way to avoid a vote on the substitute, unless some Senator wishes to address himself to the question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course, even if the substitute is pending, it could be the basis of continuing speeches this afternoon, which we know are contemplated in respect to the bill itself, and the program of speeches probably would continue without voting on the substitute. The very earnest desire of the Senator from Michigan was to bring this particular phase of the matter to a definite conclusion.

Mr. RUSSELL. I share the desire expressed by the Senator from Michigan, and if Senators who have speeches ready would restrain themselves for a moment, a vote on the substitute would be in order, and the Senate could pro-

ceed to vote on it without any delay whatever.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is quite correct about that. I am assuming, however, in view of the objection to the unanimous-consent request, that there would be objection to the procedure the Senator has indicated, and of course Senators have ample resources at their command to prevent the result.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wanted to make clear that there was no parliamentary obstacle to an immediate vote on the substitute.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think my second request meets the desire of the able Senator from New Mexico, and on that basis I am hoping it may be agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I will go further than that. My reason for objecting was only in order that Senators might have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the substitute, but if the parliamentary situation is such that the Senate can vote now, I am willing that the vote may be taken at this time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand the Senator withdraws his objection to my original request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Peace and Reconstruction Act of 1948.'

#### "FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. The Congress finds that after the horror and devastation of World War II the victorious coalition, responding to the highest and noblest hopes of mankind everywhere, established the United Nations for the promotion and maintenance of peace. It is the declared purpose of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security; to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace; to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and the self-determination of peoples; to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character; to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples; and to be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these ends. Realization of these principles through the United Nations remains the world's last best hope for peace. The United States as initiator of the United Nations and a signatory to its Charter has the high responsibility of strengthening its organization and, through it, building the foundations of an enduring peace.

"Yet the foreign policy of the United States as embodied in the Truman doctrine and as practiced continuously since the announcement of that doctrine has seriously weakened the United Nations as an instrument for world peace and collaboration, and negated the high purposes of its Charter. Instead of taking collective measures, through the United Nations, for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, unilateral action under the Truman doctrine has divided the world into hostile blocs. Instead

of employing international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples, the Truman doctrine has employed the economic might of the United States unilaterally for political ends. Instead of respecting the principle of equal rights and the self-determination of peoples, the Truman doctrine has intervened in the internal affairs of other nations. Instead of making use of the United Nations as a center for harmonizing the actions of nations, the Truman doctrine has bypassed the United Nations and provoked international suspicion and tension which, if unchecked, can lead only to war.

"It is therefore declared to be the policy of the Congress that the United States take immediate steps to repudiate the Truman doctrine and reassert leadership in the great task of establishing and maintaining peace through the United Nations. It is the further policy of the Congress to respond to the desperate need of the European victims of Axis aggression for the reconstruction and economic development of their war-devastated lands by providing aid through the instrumentality of the United Nations and in accordance with the purpose of its Charter to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples, while guaranteeing their right to determine for themselves the forms of their social, political, and economic institutions, without intervention or interference.

#### "UNITED NATIONS EUROPEAN RECONSTRUCTION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 3. (a) The Congress calls upon the President to request the Secretary General of the United Nations to convene a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations at the earliest possible date.

"(b) The Congress calls upon the President to instruct the representatives of the United States in the General Assembly, upon the convening of that body, to submit a proposal for the establishment of a European Reconstruction and Economic Development Administration (herein referred to as the 'Administration') within the United Nations, based upon the following principles:

"(1) The Administration shall include representatives of the United States and of all European members of the United Nations.

"(2) The Administration shall be charged with the administration and distribution of a European Reconstruction and Economic Development Fund (herein referred to as the 'fund').

"(3) The fund shall be made up by voluntary contributions from members of the United Nations, or by quotas determined by the Administration on the basis of ability to pay and shall be in the aggregate amount of at least \$25,000,000,000 over a period of 5 years.

"(4) The fund shall be available to provide loans or grants to individual European nations for the purposes of rehabilitation, reconstruction, and economic development, to the end that the immediate human suffering of their people may be alleviated and their industry and agriculture restored and placed on a self-sustaining basis at the earliest practicable time. In addition, loans and grants may be made available for industrial development, with special emphasis on the industrially backward nations, to raise the living standards of their people, provide for the full utilization of their natural resources and promote economic cooperation and world trade.

"(5) Priority in the allocation of funds shall be given to those nations which suffered most severely from Axis aggression. All allocations of funds shall be based solely on this consideration and on the basis of need, without regard to the character of the political and social institutions of the recipient nation and without the imposition of any

political conditions or any economic conditions other than those necessary to insure that the allocated funds will be expended for the purpose for which the allocation was made, without waste or inefficiency.

"(6) The entire fund shall be used exclusively for peaceful purposes, and no allocation shall be made to finance the purchase, manufacture, or maintenance of any military establishment, armaments, munitions, military supplies, or equipment of any kind or character whatsoever.

"(7) Special attention shall be given to raising the levels of food production, providing an ever-normal world food granary and raising the minimum nutrition and shelter standards of all recipient nations.

"SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$5,000,000,000 for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1948, and a like sum for each of the four fiscal years next following, which shall be available for payment by the United States to the European Reconstruction and Economic Development Administration from and after the date it is established.

#### "EMERGENCY AID

"SEC. 5. In order to provide immediate emergency relief to the peoples of the war devastated European nations pending the establishment of the United Nations European Reconstruction and Economic Development Administration, the President, acting through such departments, agencies, or independent establishments of the Government as he shall direct, may make grants to the governments of European nations to finance the procurement, from any source determined by the recipient of food or fuel or any commodity, machinery, or equipment required for the production of food or fuel. In determining the nations to which grants shall be made under this section, and the amounts of such grants, the President shall be bound by the provisions of subdivision (5) of section 3 of this act and no economic, political, or other conditions shall be attached to such grants except for the united purpose expressly provided in subdivision (5) of section 3 of this act.

"SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$500,000,000 to carry out the provisions of section 5 of this act: *Provided*, That no funds shall be obligated under such appropriation subsequent to January 1, 1949, or the date of the organization of the United Nations Reconstruction and Economic Development Administration, whichever is earlier.

#### "REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS

"SEC. 7. From and after the effective date of this act, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States shall not in time of peace, unless the Security Council of the United Nations shall otherwise determine, give or sell to any other nation any military or naval equipment, munitions, arms, armament, or supplies, or finance the purchase of the same by any other nation, and any moneys heretofore appropriated by the Congress for any such purpose shall not be obligated therefor.

"SEC. 8. It shall be the declared policy of the United States to promote universal disarmament as a means of preventing war and removing the crushing burden of mounting armament appropriations from the people of all lands, including our own. To that end, the Congress calls upon the representatives of the United States in the United Nations to propose to the Commission for Conventional Armaments the immediate reduction by all nations in their armament and military expenditures for all types of armaments to an amount not in excess of 10 per centum of the current rate."

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.



Mr. RUSSELL. A parliamentary inquiry. I am prepared to vote, but it occurred to me that it might be well to have a quorum called.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Michigan understands that the order is entered for an immediate ye-and-nay vote, and therefore I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the Senate will immediately vote thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Overton
Brewster	Hill	Pepper
Bricker	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Holland	Revercomb
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kem	Smith
Capper	Kilgore	Sparkman
Chavez	Knowland	Stennis
Connally	Langer	Stewart
Cooper	Lodge	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Taylor
Downey	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Dworschak	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McGrath	Thye
Ecton	McKellar	Tobey
Ellender	Martin	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Maybank	Watkins
Flanders	Millikin	Wherry
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Murray	Williams
Green	O'Connor	Wilson

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent because of the death of the Governor of Connecticut.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is detained on official committee business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is unavoidably detained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement the question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] in the nature of a substitute. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent because of the death of the Governor of Connecticut. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are unavoidably detained. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is detained on official committee business. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is absent because of illness.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent attending the funeral services of the late Governor of Connecticut, Hon. James L. McConaughy.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 3, nays 74, as follows:

YEAS—3		
Langer	Pepper	Taylor
NAYS—74		
Aiken	Green	O'Connor
Ball	Gurney	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Overton
Bricker	Hill	Reed
Bridges	Hoey	Revercomb
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Jenner	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Capper	Kem	Sparkman
Chavez	Kilgore	Stennis
Connally	Knowland	Stewart
Cooper	Lodge	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Dworschak	McClellan	Thye
Eastland	McGrath	Tobey
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	Martin	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Flanders	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Moore	Williams
George	Murray	

#### NOT VOTING—19

Baldwin	McFarland	Umstead
Bushfield	McMahon	Wagner
Cain	Magnuson	White
Donnell	Malone	Wilson
Hatch	Morse	Young
Hawkes	Myers	
McCarthy	Tydings	

So Mr. TAYLOR's amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It deals with the authorization in the bill providing for the possible charter foreign of 300 dry cargo ships.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maine on behalf of himself and other Senators will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, line 24, beginning with the word "merchant", it is proposed to strike out all through "subsection," on page 16, line 1.

On page 16, beginning with line 10, it is proposed to strike out all through line 20.

On page 16, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "(5)" and insert in lieu thereof "(4)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to explain very briefly what the amendment involves.

There is a provision in the bill that 300 American ships may be chartered foreign. We have already adopted an amendment that 50 percent of the American products going into this project shall be carried in American bottoms. This amendment will complement the other very well because, according to present figures, foreign-flag ships now have approximately sufficient capacity to carry 50 percent of the freight, and Americans now have a similar capacity in operation under the Maritime Commission. Consequently the adoption of this amendment will simply confirm the status quo and enable the intent of the 50-percent amendment properly to be carried out.

There is very great concern in the shipping industry over the future of our merchant marine. There is a very extensive shipbuilding program going on in foreign countries. Fifteen million tons are either under construction, contracted for, or contemplated. For that purpose 6,000,000 tons of steel will be required, and it is contemplated that 2,000,000 tons of such steel may come from this country.

The State Department has recommended deferring the portion of the ship-construction program which has not yet been contracted for. The Administrator may very well desire to exercise further restriction as to the amount of steel which may be used for a priority of this character. Inasmuch as there are sufficient ships for the present to solve the problem, I hope that the construction in European shipyards will not be carried on to the limit of their present capacity, which is twice the normal construction.

However, that situation is not affected by this amendment, except as it may be an indication of our desire.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Maine is offering an amendment to remove from the bill a provision authorizing the temporary transfer of 300 of our Liberty ships.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Representative BLAND, of Virginia, has served on the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for more than a quarter of a century. During 14 years of that time he was chairman of the committee. In my judgment there is no Member of the Congress who is more familiar with our merchant marine than is Representative BLAND. I have discussed this question with him, and he tells me that in his opinion it would be very injurious to our merchant marine if we transferred any more of these ships to foreign countries.

Mr. BREWSTER. I may say to the Senator from Virginia that 2 days ago I placed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. BLAND indicating his very serious opposition to such a program. At that time I characterized him as one of the oldest and best friends of the American merchant marine.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I also wish to say that my colleague from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who has left the Chamber to attend the hearings of the Committee on Banking and Currency on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. McCabe, asked me to say for him, if I had an opportunity to do so, that he is in sympathy with this amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the section of the bill which the able Senator from Maine proposes to delete is the only section in the bill, I believe, with respect to which the Committee on Foreign Relations divided in its consideration of the bill. There was very sharp division in the committee on the subject.

As the bill was originally submitted, it provided for not only the charter but the sale of ships to foreign countries. The committee struck out the provision for the sale of ships, and left in the bill the provision for the charter of ships.

As chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee I am not in a position to approve the amendment of the Senator from Maine on behalf of the committee. But in my own personal capacity I should like to say that it seems to me that since Congress itself within the past 60 days has passed a bill, which has become the law of the land, prohibiting the charter or sale of any of our ships to foreign countries, this provision in this bill would be, to put it mildly, inappropriate.

So far as the Senator from Michigan in his personal capacity is concerned, he will vote for the amendment of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the other day, when this amendment was offered, to be printed and lie on the table, I made a brief statement with reference to the reason why the committee inserted the provision in the bill. As the Senator from Michigan has stated, when the bill came to the committee originally it carried a provision for the sale of 200 ships

and the chartering of 300 ships, on the theory that the 2,000 ships which are now tied up in the harbors and ports and streams of this country might well be utilized to carry some of the freight which is to be procured under this proposed act; and that inasmuch as it would require a considerable outlay of money to condition those ships so as to make them seaworthy, it might be well to charter some of them and sell some of them, in an aggregate number of 500, to foreign countries, in order to enable them to carry that proportion of the commodities to be procured in other countries than the United States, or even in this country to some extent.

Attention was called at the time to the fact that the Senate had just passed a bill prohibiting either the sale or the charter of these ships to any person not of American citizenship. There was a division in the committee with reference to that matter. In the committee I voted for the provision, because I felt that on the showing made in regard to these particular ships there would be a saving to the Treasury of the United States if some of the 2,000 ships—one-quarter of them, to be exact—were made available to the countries which are to be the beneficiaries of this program, to enable them to carry in such temporarily chartered ships a part of the commodities to be procured.

But since the amendment was adopted in the committee, additional information has become available, and it indicates that probably it would cost approximately \$25,000 to recondition each of these ships. Three hundred times \$25,000 is a considerable amount of money, and probably it would have to come out of the Treasury of the United States. So the amount of net savings on account of the use of these ships, through their charter to other countries, thus would be considerably reduced.

When the committee struck out the provision for the sale of 200 ships, it was stated by the State Department, through its spokesman, that it would cost approximately \$50,000,000 out of the Treasury to haul these products, without the charter or sale of any of these ships; and we were really asked to add \$50,000,000 to the \$5,300,000,000 in order to take care of that item. However, that was not done.

In view of all these circumstances, I am not prepared today to oppose the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Maine, eliminating the provision for the chartering of 300 ships. We might argue legitimately as to the amount of money that would be saved or as to how much it would cost the Treasury, depending on whether we charter them or do not charter them; and I suppose we might contend that the last word of Congress which is inconsistent with some previous act would take precedence over that act and would become effective.

But inasmuch as a few days ago the Congress did enact a law prohibiting the charter or sale of any of these ships, I do not wish to be insistent or to have the Senate be insistent in retaining this paragraph in the bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In that connection I have also had the information about which I spoke to the Senator the other day, namely, that so long as these ships operate under the American flag, there will be, I believe, an estimated \$27,000,000 paid to the United States Government for their charter or hire, under the provision that 15 percent of the value of the ships shall be paid each year. Of course, there will possibly be increased costs of operation in sailing them under the American flag, but we recognize that in connection with all our maritime legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I appreciate that. I am told that there possibly would be an income of \$27,000,000, but that would be offset by the cost of operating the ships, the sale of which was contemplated as the proposal came to the committee originally.

These ships were built as a result of the war, Mr. President. I express the earnest hope that we shall not allow these ships, which were built with the money of the taxpayers of the United States, to rot in the harbors and rivers and estuaries of the United States, without trying to put them to some use. Although they were wartime ships, they cost the American people considerable sums of money.

So I hope that what we do today will not in any way interfere with the use of those ships for the benefit of the American merchant marine, but will stimulate their use either by our own country or through private ownership, if anyone is willing to buy them and operate them, so that we shall not be compelled to see approximately 2,000 Liberty ships rot in our harbors during the next 2 years.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I hope the Senator from Kentucky will also find himself in agreement with the policy indicated by the State Department, namely, that the European ship-construction program should be somewhat slowed down, since it is not an essential priority. The ships are available. Although we wish to keep up their normal shipbuilding and shipping activity, nevertheless if it were to be carried too far, that obviously would be an unwarranted strain on our steel supply, as well as on the manpower of the foreign countries.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that situation. It is a complicated matter. The question of how much steel to be applied to these purposes we should allocate to foreign countries, and so forth, definitely enters into the situation.

At any rate, I hope we shall utilize the existing ships to the best possible purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator whether he knows how much steel is to be allocated in the 4-year period of the Marshall plan, and particularly in the first year, for the construction of ships under the shipbuilding programs of the recipient countries.

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot answer that question.



Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it is contemplated that 2,000,000 tons of steel shall be exported. We cannot say definitely whether all of it will go into the building of ships or into other channels, although obviously not all of it would be used for the building of ships.

Mr. BARKLEY. Obviously all of it will not go into the building of ships.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course not. But I wonder whether a break-down has been made, to show how much of the steel is allocated to the shipbuilding program of the 16 countries.

Mr. BREWSTER. They contemplate building ships which will require 6,000,000 tons of steel in the next 4 years. That is the requirement for the shipbuilding program for Europe. That is the total drain, regardless of whether it is on our steel supply or on the European steel supply.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. Of course, undoubtedly a considerable portion of the steel which will be required by the European countries will come from the United States. Of course, much of the steel they require will come from the Ruhr. But I do not think there is any break-down to show how much of the steel will be allocated to shipbuilding.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I inquire who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If 300 of these ships should be chartered, would that permit a reduction in allotment of steel for the shipbuilding program this year under the Marshall plan?

Mr. BREWSTER. It would have no direct effect upon it at all.

Mr. WHERRY. None whatever?

Mr. BREWSTER. It would be wholly in the hands of the Administrator of the program to determine whether he would exercise his authority to retard the European ship construction, according to whether he considered it essential.

Mr. WHERRY. No; I did not mean that.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is possible that if the 300 ships were used in order to carry the products to Europe it would reduce the amount of steel that would be necessary in order to construct new ships.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Administrator would have the right, and it would be his duty, to take that into consideration in determining the allotment of the steel to recipient nations.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I raised. I think it is a very salient point.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whether the 300 ships were used by the recipient countries or by the United States, or by some private enterprise, that would have no direct effect.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. I was merely wondering whether, in the final analysis, if the ships were chartered and put into operation, it would not relieve the commitment of steel to the amount involved and make it that much easier on a commodity which is very scarce in this country at the present time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whether chartered or not, their use would undoubtedly reduce the requirement for steel in shipbuilding.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I merely want to say a word or two on this matter. The form in which it was first presented to the committee has already been stated in the debate. There are two aspects of it; on the one hand, the additional expense of Government operation, and on the other, the desirability of aiding our merchant marine and our merchant seamen.

Mr. President, it seems to me there is one other point worthy of note. In the great program we are initiating, it seems to me to be just as well that we here control as much as we can the shipping itself, the vessels, and the sending of the vessels to the different ports. Mr. President, because of the consideration of giving employment to our American merchant marine, together with all the other considerations, I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as one member of the committee who voted against putting this language in the bill, I think perhaps I should say a word for the Record. There was one argument in favor of the language which was persuasive, and that was that it would tend to reduce the cost of operations under the bill. But I felt that there were many qualifying factors which diminished the saving that would occur. I also felt that broad considerations of national policy would make it advisable for us to maintain a merchant marine and made it on the whole desirable that the language should not be retained in the bill. Therefore, I am happy to give my support to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I merely wish to subscribe to that sentiment. I believe we made a great mistake after the last war in letting our merchant marine deteriorate. It cost us many hundreds of millions of dollars to restore it. At one time during the war, we had the basis of the greatest merchant marine that any nation has ever had. In many respects I think the great marine power we once possessed has been dissipated. I think the time will come, if we further dissipate it, when we shall have to restore it at a vastly increased expenditure to the country. Therefore, in the national interest, in furtherance of our national economy, and out of a due regard to the merchant seamen who would be thrown out of employment if the proviso were retained in the bill, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Maine will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ives in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to Senate bill 2202, commonly known as the Marshall plan. The so-called Marshall plan is the most mysterious crossword puzzle of the century. It has been presented to the people of this Nation as being so many different things that they are completely confused and bewildered. The Nation has been

divided into groups and each group has been propagandized separately to show that they may be benefited, but very little has been said about the destruction that will be wrought to our Nation as a whole.

Religious groups throughout the country have been propagandized and told that the Marshall plan is a great humanitarian act of charity. Industrialists have been told that it will provide a highly profitable foreign market for the goods they manufacture. Farmers are told that it will keep agricultural commodity prices high. Laboring people are told that it will provide them with plenty of jobs at high wages. The people of certain foreign countries are told that it will rebuild their factories, increase their standard of living, and restore their economy. The rank and file of patriotic American citizens who believe in the American constitutional form of government and who do not want to see our Government converted to socialism or communism are told that the Marshall plan will stop communism dead in its tracks in Europe before it spreads across the Atlantic Ocean and takes control here. Mothers and fathers are being told again and again and again that it will keep their boys and girls from being called to fight and perhaps die on foreign soil. American voters are being told, "See how we dehorned the thing or pulled its teeth—vote for us." American taxpayers are being told to "wait patiently until we get through giving everything away and then we will reduce your taxes." Consequently, Mr. President, it is difficult to know what the Marshall mystery plan really is.

The so-called Marshall plan not only originated mysteriously but since its start it has been amended or modified to meet the whims of any person or group whose support the administration thought was needed to assure the passage of the measure by Congress. Secretary Marshall said, "All or nothing." So he was slapped down in effigy by amending the proposal to authorize it in four smaller yearly doses instead of just one big 4-year dose. This great improvement was evidently based on the same philosophy that applies to cutting off the dog's tail inch at a whack so it will not hurt so much. It really does not hurt the man with the ax who cuts off the dog's tail, but the poor dog, like the American taxpayer, can only howl in a language his tormenters cannot or will not understand.

A great howl went up about permitting the plan to be administered by the Secretary of State. So the plan was amended to let somebody else administer it. But the joke is that both the Secretary of State and the new Administrator are appointees of the same President, who, of course, is the actual administrator, and each must perform as instructed by his boss, the President. So the only difference created by that change is to set up a new bureau under a newly created assistant to the President, and to create more Federal jobs.

On top of all this confusion, deception, and meaningless changes the bill finally comes to the floor of the Senate in printed form, the reading of which convinces me



that it will permit the executive branch of our Government to do anything under the shining sun, from playing tiddly winks to waging war with anyone or any nation from Helsinki to Shanghai. I am firmly convinced that the master minds in their hideouts who advise our executive branch care not one whit what is printed in the bill, just as long as the authorization for the \$5,000,000,000 is there. That is the essence of the Marshall plan—billions, billions, and more billions to scatter to the four winds.

So, Mr. President, with this picture of the Marshall plan in mind I shall now analyze it and express my views on the subject. In expressing my views on the plan, let it be distinctly understood that I am expressing them exclusively on the plan, and making no statements or insinuations about persons. I give full credit to the honesty, sincerity, and patriotism of every Member of the Senate. Here each of us has the unquestioned right to his own opinion and his own way of expressing his opinion. I am merely expressing my own opinion of the plan.

In the first place, it certainly cannot be denied that the Marshall plan, from an over-all viewpoint, follows the same general line as many previous bills which have been under consideration by the Senate, and which were approved by the Senate. I refer to lend-lease, to UNRRA, the British gift-loan, Greek-Turkey aid, aid to China, and the interim France-Italy contribution. I opposed each and every one of those plans for several good and valid reasons. One good reason is that such tactics constitute meddling in the internal affairs of foreign nations and step by step lead to one war after another. Another reason is that such tactics result only in pouring billions of dollars down rat-holes, while conditions in recipient nations have constantly grown worse. Another reason is that it guts our Treasury, impoverishes our taxpayers, and weakens our economic structure at a time when another war is staring us in the face and we need a strong economy. Another reason is that all of these expedients have taken money from American taxpayers, either by taxation or by the borrowing process, and given their money to foreigners. I consider such action to be a flagrant violation of the Constitution of the United States of America.

Inasmuch as I have taken a solemn oath to uphold and defend the Constitution it is my purpose to respect that oath. It is my judgment, Mr. President, that, regardless of the language used, whether the Marshall plan calls for direct donations or loans, the net result will be that the sum total cost of both the direct grants and the loans must ultimately be paid by the American taxpayer.

As I read the Constitution of the United States, I find nothing in that document which authorizes the Congress to appropriate the money of the American taxpayer out of the Treasury and give it to some foreign government. That reason alone, I think, is sufficient cause for opposing the Marshall plan even if I had no other reason. I believe that the Constitution was adopted with the understanding and with the full intention that it

should be observed by the Congress of the United States.

Suppose we consider the Marshall plan as a great humanitarian act of charity, as is claimed by some of its proponents. This naturally has a strong appeal to me because I believe sincerely in charity. Charity is taught and recommended by the Holy Scriptures, but as I interpret the the commandments of God and the teachings of Christ, they were directed to individual human beings and not to corporations or governmental organizations. In the first place, men and women have souls while organizations are soulless.

In some cases charity might be practiced as an eternal protection to the human soul. When the body is laid to rest and the soul goes on to meet its Maker an accounting of charitable activities of the individual must be made. No part of any organization is expected to go on to an eternal haven of rest or even eternal torture.

Furthermore, Mr. President, under our form of Government there is supposed to be a complete separation of church and State. Saints and sinners alike hold equal positions as citizens under our democratic form of government, and if the principle of equality and justice is a part of our governmental philosophy is it fair and just to take by force personal property from those who do not believe in charity and use it for that purpose? I think not.

Furthermore, Mr. President, when our wise forefathers wrote the Constitution of the United States, I believe they wrote the greatest document, except for the Holy Bible, ever penned by the hand of civilized and Christianized man. I believe that if ever there were inspired men the framers of our Constitution were such.

The Constitution of the United States is without doubt patterned after the Holy Bible. Our forebears recognized that there would be many citizens of our Nation who would be believers in God and many who would not be, so they wrote a constitution that would include both classes and at the same time give full protection from a governmental standpoint to each class. They did this by carefully putting down in black and white the individual powers which the citizens of this Nation transferred or delegated to their Federal Government. They were specific in listing these delegated powers. They put them down in one, two, three order. After they had enumerated all the personal powers which the citizens were delegating to their Federal Government they studied the matter further and came to the conclusion that at some time in the future some bright, designing persons might for selfish reasons try to twist the meaning of the delegated personal powers and construe them to mean something utterly different than was intended or was actually written in the Constitution. So they wrote the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, and in amendment X they nailed the meaning down by specifically stating that all powers not therein delegated to the Federal Government, or to State governments, were retained by the people.

Mr. President, the citizens of this Nation retained many powers or rights unto themselves. They retained the right to conduct all private enterprise; the right to worship God; the right of free speech; and many other rights and powers. As a matter of fact there is not one word, syllable, or sentence in the Constitution wherein the people of this Republic ever delegated to their Federal Government the power to exercise charity for them. Consequently, Mr. President, as a duly elected official of the Government I do not have the power to exercise charity on behalf of its citizens, and regardless of the fact that I most sincerely believe in charity, I shall not violate the Constitution of the United States even to do the thing I should like to see done.

I will, as a private citizen, go down into my own pocket and take as much of my personal money as I can afford to contribute to charity. I will give to whomsoever I may choose in any nation on earth, regardless of race, religion, color, or political belief, if such people are hungry or sick and unable to sustain themselves. On the other hand, Mr. President, I will not as a Member of the Senate go into the pockets of other citizens and extract one thin dime by taxation or public borrowing to give it as charity to foreigners. I will not do it because, under the Constitution, I do not possess the authority to do so.

Now, Mr. President, if the people of this Nation want to turn their Government into a charitable organization, it is within their power to do so by the process of amending the Constitution. But I warn them that when that is done, it will be the last of our Republic of free men. When free people delegate to their Government the right to exercise charity for them, they are granting a limitless power to their law makers which will ultimately destroy their Government.

As I have stated, Mr. President, the people of this Nation have the power to amend their Constitution to provide for their Federal Government exercising charity for them. If that is what they want to do, I offer no objection to their exercising that right and privilege. But so long as the Constitution remains as it now is, each citizen has the personal right to exercise his or her own charity individually, or through privately conducted charitable organizations or churches. This is exactly what they have been doing ever since our Government was organized. I have explicit confidence in their continuing to exercise their own charity most generously so long as our Nation exists as a nation of free people, because no greater truth was ever spoken than, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." Furthermore, Mr. President, when Government takes over the administration of charity, it will give the people ample excuse for discontinuing personal charity donations to private charitable organizations and churches, and those great humanitarian organizations will be forced to discontinue operations.

Mr. President, one of the main objectives of communism is to destroy worship of God. If, by the process of shifting responsibility for charity from churches to Government, churches can be robbed



of contributions for charity, and as a consequence be stripped of the power to administer aid to poor, hungry, helpless people, will not that help destroy churches and the faith people have in the teachings of our Lord? I think so.

Charity to Europe? Yes, Mr. President, I am in favor of it when granted by individuals or churches and private agencies under private control. I am for this method of aiding Europe to get back on her feet, but when it comes to violating the Constitution of the United States by taxing the American citizen and distributing billions of his dollars in Europe on the theory that we can bribe those nations not to go communistic, I am opposed to the theory, and I have no confidence in the result.

Now, Mr. President, we come to another phase of the general situation in Europe. We are told that there is need for money to be granted to Europe in the form of loans for the rehabilitation of industry.

It is my judgment that the way for loans to be made to Europe for the purpose of rehabilitating industry is for the loans to be made by private individuals in this country who have money to lend, and who will lend it on good, sound business propositions. If the loan will not stand on this basis, then we have no right to call it a grant of credit. We might just as well call it a gift in the first place.

There are many conditions to take into consideration when it comes to building factories and establishing industries. It is not by any means just a matter of raising the capital. It is a matter of selecting the right geographical locations with respect to supply of raw material, and proximity to potential customers. It is a question of acquiring competent and experienced management. It is a proposition of obtaining an adequate supply of contented and willing workers. There are also many other important considerations. This, Mr. President, brings us down to the one and most important question of all, the question of the kind of government under which the industries must operate.

Industries have succeeded in our Nation to such proportions that we are recognized as the greatest industrial nation on earth. Such a growth, Mr. President, is due solely to our system of government, which permits a free private-enterprise economy, with a minimum of Government controls. During the past 16 years there has been a growing tendency to destroy private enterprise by various governmental maneuverings.

Now, let us take a look at the 16 European nations which are supposed to be the beneficiaries of the Marshall plan, supposedly for the purpose of rehabilitating industry. We find they have entirely different forms of government, none of which are like ours. The people of those nations are entitled to adopt any form of government they desire. Surely it is not my purpose to criticize them because of their choice, but the fact remains that England, once the giant of nations, master of the seven seas, and one of the most prosperous and conservative governments of the whole world, has changed over to a socialistic government. This socialistic government is rapidly

taking over England's industries, and is just as rapidly sinking into oblivion, industrially, commercially, financially, and economically.

No system of private industry can possibly succeed under any government that contributes 70 cents per day per person, as England does, to feed its people. It will soon eat itself into bankruptcy. The money we donate to support this unsound and reckless policy is a rank waste, and will bankrupt the United States if continued. Most of the other European nations are in about the same category, many of them worse, possibly some of them not so bad.

Mr. President, the truth is that no system of private industry can succeed under the kind of government England has today. The same comment applies to a greater or lesser degree to every one of the 16 European nations named in the Marshall plan. This argument is supported by the fact that the citizens of those nations having capital to invest have chosen not to invest their capital in industry in their own countries, but to invest it in industries in our country and other nations. They have done this, according to reliable authority, to the extent of eighteen or twenty billions of dollars. Well, this being true, why should foreign fools step in where home folks fear to tread? Nobody contends that we can change the form of government of those 16 European nations. That is unquestionably the exclusive right of the citizens of each nation.

Rehabilitation of Europe's industry? Yes, Mr. President; I favor it when the investments are made by individual citizens of this or any other nation, and from their own funds, without Government financial assistance or Government guaranties against financial loss. Such loans must be made upon the personal judgment of the lender relative to the soundness of the investment and from the standpoint of the character of government under which the industry must operate. But when it comes to giving away to foreign nations our taxpayers' billions, I am opposed to it. Our actions are so silly that even the sensible people in England are laughing at us.

Let me read an article from page 4 of the Sunday Express, printed in London, England, August 3, 1947. Here it is:

A very large section of the population decided that with the election of a socialistic government we had automatically entered the millennium in which work did not matter any more. If you needed money, you had merely to hang out your stocking and Santa Claus would fill it. The Government at the same time decided that if only the United States would lend us sufficient dollars, we could sit back and build the heaven of their dreams without bothering too much about the facts of life. Unfortunately, the United States loaned us the money.

Note that, Mr. President, from this London newspaper:

Unfortunately, the United States loaned us the money. Unfortunately, the money is now nearly exhausted, and, unfortunately, it hasn't done us a bit of good.

I might add, the last cent of this gift of \$3,750,000,000 has been drained off. The article continues:

On the contrary, by our pledges to make sterling debts convertible into dollars on re-

quest and by hog-tying ourselves by the notorious article 9 so that we cannot even move food we need from the larders of the Empire to the homeland's kitchens, we have brought disaster upon us.

So, here, Mr. President, we have a perfect example of our Government being eager to bankrupt our own Nation by shoveling out billions of dollars to a socialistic nation, while their newspapers accuse us of bringing disaster upon their nation by forcing those billions upon them. Of course, nobody expects the British loan to be repaid, and anyone who gave the matter any study knew before the loan was made that it would never be paid. And all the money our Government is pouring down every rat hole in every foreign nation on earth is not only hastening our own day of financial disaster, but it is laying the foundation to make every foreign nation hate us when the day finally comes when we shall be forced by circumstances to stop shoveling out our money to them.

Mr. President, I believe in giving the people the absolute truth about all legislation. We cannot enact laws which leave the people on the outside looking in. Every law the Congress enacts directly affects the people and for this reason alone the people should be given all the facts regarding any legislation. In the case of the program we are now considering, the people have not been given all the truth. They have been fed largely upon pure fiction and half-truths. They have had a picture of sheer fantasy dangled before their eyes by the bureaucratic propaganda experts, when they should have been shown the honest, naked truth.

Huge sums of money have been spent on radio and public print to implant in the minds of our American citizens the specter of starvation hovering over the homes in all European lands, but nothing has been told our people of the sad results which will inevitably come to them if we are to continue the looting of our own treasure house. Nothing has been said by these bureaucratic propagandists about robbing our oil stores, our coal pits, our iron mines through this give-away program so that Uncle Sam may appear in the role of Peter the Giver to the European politicians. The real cost of this program to the American citizen, to his State, and his community, is studiously avoided, for the proponents of the plan know full well that to give the American people the whole truth would be to rob themselves of the glory they hope to reap from putting over this wasteful program.

Mr. President, the Marshall program will probably cost the people of my State of Texas more than a billion dollars before we see the last of it. The present dole is but the entering wedge for things to come. It will not prevent war nor will it stop the greedy aggressions of the Russian bear, but it will play a most important role in degrading and pauperizing this beautiful land of ours.

Now I come to another phase in the discussion which I feel will help the people to form a clearer picture of where we are headed. What I have to say now is in the form of a refresher course to polish up on things that have happened and



which I believe have a direct bearing upon any and all things promulgated by and indulged in by our so-called master strategists. And, by the way, Mr. President, I am one who is sick and tired of being told that I must follow any and all schemes because this Mr. Big or that Mr. Big is for the thing. This sort of propagandizing has become a cheap racket, and a low device to trap unsuspecting or unthinking people.

In the appraisals of foreign affairs which have been given to the American people for the past 8 or 10 years, estimates have been uniformly wrong. I am sure many Senators remember the statement made by the then President of the United States, in an address in Boston on October 30, 1940, when he said:

And while I am talking to you mothers and fathers I give you one more assurance; I have said this before but I shall say it again, and again, and again: Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars. They are going into training to form a force so strong that by its very existence it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores. The purpose of our defense is defense.

I am not uncharitable enough to say that the President of the United States was dishonest with the people, that he was not sincere with the people. I think the facts are that he simply did not know. I think most of us remember that the people of America were told, when we finally got into the war, that we got into it to protect the rights of all the small nations of Europe as well as the large ones. We were told that we were fighting a war for the maintenance of the democratic form of government. Do you think, Mr. President, these statements were insincere statements? Do you think, even though the statements came to us from the executive department of Government, that those who made them were dishonest? Certainly it would be uncharitable to reach such a conclusion; so I believe the answer must be that those who were conducting our foreign affairs simply did not know.

Do you think, Mr. President, when the great principles of the Atlantic Charter were broadcast to the people of this Nation, when the people were told we were fighting a war to liberate the peoples of the nations of Europe from dictatorship, that it was an insincere statement? Or again, do you think it was simply a statement made by those who did not know Europe and did not know the conditions which we would face when the war was over? Do you think that all the glowing reports which we received following conferences with Russia at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam were mere fiction, made out of whole cloth, and distributed to the American people to mislead them? Or do you think that the executive department of our Government was sincere in what it told the public, but simply was misinformed? Do you think, Mr. President, that they were dishonest or do you think they were simply mistaken?

I am inclined to accept the more charitable view and say that all these series of errors came about because of the fact that the executive department of Government, including our State Department, simply did not know. But there is one thing the American people do

know today; they know that through the process of negotiation and with the acceptance and approval of the executive department, Joe Stalin has been firmly planted in control of most of the Balkan countries, half of Germany, all of Czechoslovakia, and that he has taken over a large part of Poland, and made vassal states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, with Finland on the way.

In other words, through negotiation with those who are charged with handling the foreign affairs of this Nation we find Joe Stalin has actually been given control of about one-half of Europe.

But the executive departments of this Government, including the State Department, tell us that this plan of vast loans or gifts to Europe is the only remedy. I might have more confidence in the recommendations of the executive departments of Government and in the recommendations of the State Department if it had not been for the fact that their batting average thus far has been so miserably low.

Mr. President, I have discussed the so-called Marshall plan according to the numerous and various claims that have been made for it and according to the way the bill in printed form came to this Senate floor. But there is another side to this story. It is the side which has not been mentioned. Perhaps some may think it unwise to discuss the true conditions which face us, but I prefer to be open and frank and place all the cards on the table face up.

The cold, stark, naked truth is that World War II is still in progress. Our fine American sons, on the fields of battle, beat Germany, Italy, and Japan into complete and unconditional surrender, just as they started out to do; but after they won the war our diplomats lost the peace. Our executive department failed to understand that it takes just as strong military forces to win the peace as it takes to win the war. So they disbanded our military forces, gave much of our military equipment to greedy aggressors, adopted a program to give away our resources by the billions, and attempted to write the peace treaties over cocktail glasses.

They have failed miserably and are now trying to cover up their failures by giving away more billions of dollars. All the billions we have shipped to Europe since the war have gone down the sewer, and everybody must admit that the conditions over there are more dangerous now than they were before we sent a single dollar. Dollar soldiers will not win the peace.

When the two world's greatest tyrant aggressors, Hitler and Stalin, met to carve up and divide Poland, they proved themselves to be partners in crime. That pair played true to gang rules—either fight together or separately, or fight each other, but conquer. Hitler was eliminated, but Stalin kept marching on. He never stopped one moment. We may call it nazism, fascism, or communism, or any other ism, but its real name is atheism.

This world is now embroiled in the most terrible religious war the world has ever witnessed. It is a global conflict. Stalin is carrying the Communist flag at

the head of the evil forces. The objective is world revolution, a communistic dictatorship, and enslavement of the masses in every nation of the world. This is Stalin's program. It has always been the Communist program. Communism is founded upon this sadistic philosophy.

Mr. President, with the whole world in turmoil and confusion, I cannot give my approval to a colossal give-away plan of billions of our resources when it is plain to see that the billions already given have been completely wasted. I think this give-away policy is the wrong approach to the solution of our own and world problems. Whenever it is decided by the people of this Nation, through their authorized representatives, that our Nation is in danger from without, I am willing to go all-out with all the resources at our command to defend and preserve our Nation. But if we continue to follow the path of trying to bribe or pacify the enemies of freedom and liberty with dollars, it will only weaken our economy and can very easily weaken it to the point where we may be unable to successfully wage war with the only weapons that world bandits and global aggressors can understand and respect.

Mr. President, no one has condemned Communism more than I have, and few started condemning it earlier than I did. I want to clean it out here at home, where it has become entrenched in our Government, in leadership of our labor unions, in our schools, and, sad to say, in our churches. Also I want to do everything we can to stamp it out elsewhere.

I recognize our responsibility in world affairs and am willing for our Government to assume full responsibility and world leadership for a just peace, but I am not in favor of the Marshall plan as it is now before us, because I do not believe it will accomplish this highly desired end. In fact, I believe it will do much harm. It is totally impracticable. We need to adopt an entirely different plan.

We need to keep our own record clean by eradicating all Communists and communistic or socialistic sympathizers from Government service.

We need to readopt the Constitution of the United States of America. We need to free our private enterprise system of all governmental strangulation and governmental competition.

We need to reduce Government expense and take the heavy load off of our overburdened taxpayers. We must reestablish a sound government and a realistic system of free private enterprise to support a sound government.

If we do this our economy will become strong enough to support an army and navy and air force so strong and powerful that no nation or combination of nations will ever dare attack us.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the Marshall give-away plan. I am in favor of adding to the Marshall plan billions in appropriations for a strong military defense.

I am in favor of billions for defense to protect and safeguard our nation, our people, our homes, our liberty, our freedom, and everything we hold dear—yes, billions to assure peace to all freedom-loving peoples in all nations of the world.



Mr. President, I am in favor of billions for defense for the perpetuation of our American way of life for ourselves here at home as provided under our constitutional system of Government, but not one cent to sustain or bolster tottering socialistic and communistic governments, which have never given freedom, prosperity, or happiness to the people of their countries at anytime. Let us be fair, let us be honest, let us be practical, Mr. President; and above all, let us be truthful with the American people.

Mr. CHAVEZ obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Daniel
Ball	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hayden	Overton
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Bricker	Hill	Reed
Bridges	Hoey	Revercomb
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Jenner	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Capehart	Kem	Sparkman
Capper	Kilgore	Stennis
Chavez	Knowland	Stewart
Connally	Langer	Taft
Cooper	Lodge	Taylor
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Dworschak	McClellan	Thye
Eastland	McFarland	Tobey
Eaton	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ellender	McKellar	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
George	Moore	Wilson
Green	Murray	
Gurney	O'Connor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having responded to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I never rise in the Senate for the purpose of hearing my voice, to entertain the galleries, or to make a little noise. I have made it a point to rise when I thought I could contribute something to my fellow Senators, at least to the extent that they would think about what I suggested, not with the idea even of convincing them or with the idea of having them admit that everything I said was correct, but merely in my humble way to place an idea within their minds and to see whether or not by thinking about the idea we might be able better to understand all the ramifications of the legislation that might be pending.

While we are discussing the European recovery program, or ECA, as it is sometimes called, I deem it proper to discuss a problem in this hemisphere that, in my opinion, is a part and parcel of the success of the European recovery program.

The recovery program, as I understand it, is to be accomplished by furnishing material and financial assistance to the participating countries and other countries, including any of the zones of the occupied territory of Germany, any areas under international administration or

control and the free territory of Trieste. I take it that is what let us in certain countries that are not designated by name.

We all know that the term "furnishing materials" includes many things. It may include food commodities, machinery, factories, machine tools, heavy equipment, gasoline, and fuel oil.

Much has been said here of late about our shortage of oil, and there is no question that we are short of oil. Other countries of this continent could aid materially not only in helping us furnish supplies, including oil, to carry out the European recovery program, but could also aid materially in breaking the fuel shortage—all in keeping with the philosophy of the European recovery program and also with our boasted good-neighbor policy, if we mean it. I for one believe we mean it, notwithstanding the handicaps which are interposed by private individuals and private industry in carrying out the good-neighbor policy.

Mr. President, on February 28, 1947, President Truman visited Mexico City and there delivered an address to the Mexican people. In that speech the President reiterated how the good-neighbor policy applies to international relations the same standards of conduct that prevail among self-respecting individuals within a democratic community, and he concluded his remarks by saying, "Our two countries will not fail each other." Latin Americans as a whole believed those words of President Truman. How does this affect oil? I shall undertake to show how.

I have stated that there is a shortage of oil, and there is. Much has been said about the production of oil in Saudi Arabia, and it is known that most of our equipment for the production of oil is now going to Saudi Arabia, thousands of miles away.

I hope that Senators who have been patient and courteous enough to remain here while I address the Senate will listen closely to the remarks that I am about to make.

In the case of an emergency and a war can we depend on the production of oil in Saudi Arabia or does it behoove us, notwithstanding our efforts to get oil there, to do something to produce oil which can be obtained at our back door? The oil potentials of Mexico are large and with the permission of the Senate, I am going to talk about them, because they are directly across an artificial line from our own country, and not within striking distance of the people whose aggressions the Senate is trying to prevent—the Russians.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I was unfortunately called from the floor a moment ago. I understand the Senator is now addressing himself to the subject of Saudi Arabia, and I understand the Senator's position to be that there are proved oil fields within the United States and within the Western Hemisphere. I know it is difficult to follow the work of all the committees, but if the Senator has followed the work of the Small Business Committee closely, I am sure he recalls the statement made that we are at present behind

in this country to the extent of 67,000 oil wells, either wildcat wells or wells in proved territory. I missed a portion of the Senator's remarks, which I deeply regret. Is it the Senator's feeling that, as a matter of national security and of keeping our petroleum production efficient and up to standard, having the equipment to do so, it is essential we continue to produce, and to bring in new wells in the United States and in the Western Hemisphere for that very purpose?

Mr. CHAVEZ. And to bring in other wells 6 feet away from the border of the United States. The Senator understands me correctly, and if he will only be patient enough to follow what I shall have to say, I am sure I can convince him and anyone else who is willing to be convinced that we are neglecting something that is of importance even in the matter of national defense.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall listen with interest to the Senator's remarks. I deeply appreciate the interest of the Senator, who has always taken more than casual interest in every subject matter of which he speaks. I realize, too, that the Senator is an authority on the production of oil.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The subject may be approached from various standpoints. It may be approached from the standpoint of national defense, which is our business. It may be approached from the standpoint of giving effect to the good-neighbor policy. It may also be approached from the standpoint of giving effect to the program we are now discussing.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know that the Department of Commerce has issued an export license for 33,000 tons of steel, to be exported to Saudi Arabia as its quota?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have the figures on my desk.

Mr. President, the world-wide shortage of crude petroleum—probably the most essential natural resource for all present day industrial activity—is universally recognized as an alarming and lamentable fact. It is not too much to say that, in our own time, the dearth of oil may retard in most costly manner the continued growth of commerce and, indeed, profoundly affect, adversely, the development of modern civilization. From a nationalistic standpoint having in mind the matter of our national defense, a severe lack of oil, in the opinion of military experts, could easily be catastrophic in its effects upon our national safety. For no wheel of industry or of war can turn upon its axle without oil. That is axiomatic. We all know that to be so.

The shortage of crude petroleum is not revealed in figures of a declining production of that vital product. Crude oil production of the United States and of the world is currently breaking all records. Even so, however, the huge production volumes are unable to keep pace with the ever-increasing demands of the modern age. Although the United States is today producing approximately twice as much oil as it was producing a decade ago, nevertheless, our supply and demand relationship is so alarmingly serious as to

lead our experts to the belief that shortage of supply is of such nature as to jeopardize the national security and to threaten our means of national defense.

The Secretary of Defense recently has informed the Congress and the Nation that if war, unfortunately, should be thrust upon us, our immediate requirements for oil, in order to enable us to conduct modern warfare in our defense, would be 2,000,000 more barrels daily than our present capacity to produce. Realizing the vital danger of such a circumstance, both the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Interior have gone on record as favoring the immediate building of a synthetic-oil industry to cost, possibly, the stupendous amount of approximately \$9,000,000,000, not to mention the length of time necessary for the building of such a huge new industry. These official expressions of opinion and the solemn recommendations directed toward such tremendous effort in the attempt to provide an adequate supply of this most vital product indicate the threatening grave consequences that may befall us if the problem of scarcity cannot be solved. The situation, therefore, demands exhaustive and careful search for every possible source that may satisfy the need for more oil. New oil reserves, more abundant oil fields, are the need of the hour.

The search for oil has stimulated our interest and directed a considerable part of our effort toward developing areas located even in remote parts of the world and many thousands of miles from our own shores. These operations involve investments totaling hundreds of millions of dollars, and hazards not only incident to the nature of such business, but also involving possible international complications that call attention forcefully to the difficulties, the risks, even the wisdom of such ventures. Yet the vital need of the world for this essential product and the great relative scarcity of it impel the relentless search and the almost frantic development of large deposits wherever they are known to exist. Indeed, the acquisition and control of such deposits are jealously guarded as prized possessions of prime importance to the needs of nations.

I am cognizant of the recommendations of our Defense Secretary for the sending of large quantities of steel to far-off Saudi Arabia for use in developing the prodigious deposits of oil known to exist in that fortunate or unfortunate land. I am in favor of the development of oil reserves wherever found in the world, for I realize the need of the world economy for more and more oil. I am of the opinion, however, that, in our zeal to accomplish more in the way of adding to the world's production of oil, we have overlooked a great opportunity, an opportunity close at home and available in the land of a friendly, next-door neighbor. I speak of Mexico.

In the opinion of oil experts, Mexico is a land, blessed like regions in our own country offsetting her immediately to the north, with huge oil deposits ranking with the greatest of the earth. Mexico already has produced billions of barrels of crude petroleum from only a small portion of the areas held to be prospec-

tive producing fields probably capable of yielding many more billion barrels of this much needed product. The area has not yet been scratched. I am referring to the area of Mexico next door to the United States, not an area 10,000 miles away. The Mexican Government has undertaken an extensive program designed both to develop fully present producing oil fields and, as well, to explore, discover and develop still additional new fields. There are millions of barrels of oil across from Laredo and Del Rio, Tex., within a hundred miles of the oil fields in the State of New Mexico. It is a tremendous potential, lying next door to us, with refineries located in the State of Texas.

This effort on the part of our neighbor republic is a most worthy one and should redound greatly to the benefit of her own national economy as well as, indeed, to contribute substantially to world needs—incidentally, no doubt, allowing our own country a fair and proportionate participation. The discovery and development of huge oil reserves on our own North American Continent will be recognized, even by a lay person, as a matter of the greatest and most important moment, so far as continental defense is concerned, and surely must be regarded as a project highly to be desired. Every possible aid to further such a program should be readily forthcoming with at least equal effectiveness to the encouragement given development programs many thousands of miles away. To fail to give such notice would be to neglect the development of an economy close at home, thus to place us at disadvantage in the possible utilization of oil production within easy accessibility in time of peace and relatively easy to defend in time of war. To neglect the development of such a petroleum economy should justify our severe condemnation.

It is gratifying to learn that our Secretary of State recently informed the press that, in view of certain world conditions, our Government now is looking to Latin America for additional supplies of oil. In addition to the fact that our State Department now apparently is favorably inclined toward the discovery and development of oil reserves to the south, I am advised that American oil refiners, greatly in need of additional crude oil to enable them to continue refining operations, look with hope to any steps which may increase production in the territories of our southern neighbors. It seems to me, therefore, that the purpose of Mexico to proceed substantially in the direction of the attempted discovery and development of huge oil deposits known to exist in that country justifies our giving consideration to every possible aid in cooperation with Mexico in that regard. Such a policy on our part must be a constructive one, definitely within the so-called national interest of our country. Any lay person will quickly perceive the vital importance to the United States, both in times of peace and of war, of the presence, immediately across our southern friendly border, of large oil-producing regions.

It is a matter of current knowledge that operations to be conducted in Mexico in the effort to carry out the develop-

ment program already started there will require considerable amounts of steel products, and it is true, of course, that the entire enterprise is vitally dependent upon such deliveries. The enterprise, in fact, cannot go forward in face of a complete absence of the required steel, and it is an unfortunate fact that steel is being denied for this great project. This situation brings me to a discussion of our national policy with respect to the allocation of steel from American mills for shipments abroad and raises immediately the relative value of the different oil development enterprises abroad that are demanding shipments of steel from American mills.

The fact is that the business of developing oil resources in our neighbor country, Mexico, is now obstructed because of pressure for development elsewhere, and since this "elsewhere" happens to be some 8,000 to 10,000 miles away from our own American shores, the question of policy as to the advisability of neglecting the development of a near-at-hand economy in favor of one in a remote part of the world comes directly to the fore. In that connection, I wish to go on record as stating that mine is a "North America First" policy. I do not agree that no consideration is more important to this country than oil in the Middle East.

The oil of Mexico, the oil of Colombia, the oil of Venezuela, are more important to us than the oil of Saudi Arabia. Mr. Sumner Welles about 10 days ago said, "Suppose we had it and something happened. Would we have it the next day?" But we could have this Mexican oil the next day. I insist that oil in Mexico, a friendly next-door neighbor, as the President said, is worth more to this country, from the simple standpoint of easy and safe accessibility, both in peace and in war, than that found on the back door step of Russia, on the other side of the world. Would Russia attack the wells of Mexico or of the United States, or would she attack those in Saudi Arabia? A child could answer the question.

Why should a huge oil combine be favored in the development and exploitation of an oil reserve far away, certain to require tremendous cost in dollars and possibly a great future cost in the lives of young Americans to defend it, while nothing whatsoever is allowed to function by way of providing even a small amount of needed supplies to further a legitimate enterprise directed exclusively to the development of our own North American economy? If Congress is to be led or misled, stampeded or cajoled by the executive officers of the Government into aiding every expensive venture far from our homes, and related to the development and exploitation—for the sole benefit of a great oil combine—of the natural resources of foreign peoples whose welfare is unrelated to influences vitally affecting either our own national economy or our national defense, why should not the Congress the more wisely be expected to address itself to the business of aiding in the development of our own section of the world to the greater advantage of all of us who live here?

Looking unflinchingly at the face of stark reality, the situation today is one



in which major oil concerns are demanding for themselves practically all the casing that is coming from the entire steel-mill capacity of America. In other words, the major oil companies have cornered the steel market for oil-well supplies. There is law against the cornering of the stock market. There is a law against the cornering of the wheat market. There is a law against the cornering of the cotton and other markets. Laws today are in effect to protect the public interest against the sheer weight of money when used to corner, for a few predatory folk, the basic necessities requisite for the maintenance of the general welfare. The general welfare is what we should be interested in.

In the present instance there may be no law or no arm of our Government which can function toward the solution of this steel problem. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will have a solution.

I should like to invite attention again to the fact that of all the basic forms of wealth, oil is the natural resource most essential to all forms of industrial activity. The protection and the guaranty of a sound and continuing development of the North American petroleum economy, therefore, fall within the musts for consideration of a government that is dedicated to the principle, among others, of promoting the general welfare and providing for a common defense. Providing for the common defense, so far as we are concerned, should start right here.

It is an unhealthy condition for any industry when a few dominating agencies of the industry control its basic element of supply. It will be a sorry day for the world at large when the American oil monopoly must be recognized as controlling, exclusively, the world's most-treasured and most-needed natural resource. If capitalism ever contributed to the cause of a world war, as many of our people believe, we most certainly then must see its performance to that end.

Under present circumstances it appears impossible for Mexico to obtain supplies necessary to put her oil-development program into full operation. In the face of this condition of fact, our Defense Secretary has appeared before Congress with a "first consideration" proposition calling for the shipment to Arabia of some one-half million additional tons of steel for use of oil companies there, instead of what was mentioned, a half million additional tons of steel. It is difficult to understand how anyone can plead for action that would make it easy for an oil corporation to take unto itself, for foreign fields afar, 500,000 tons of steel without which North American enterprises could not exist.

I wish to state that in my references here to Arabia I am not particularly opposed, personally, to the Arabian project, per se. As a matter of fact, I am not at all concerned if the entire world desires to dump prodigious amounts of steel upon the Arabian Peninsula, providing, of course, it has it to dump, and also providing that in the dumping process complete neglect of the development of the North American economy does not result. As this condition of affairs

is exactly what is happening, however, I feel impelled to make references to some of the obvious features in the program which affect the welfare of the people of our own continent.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, would the Senator yield at that point, or would he prefer to continue?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. A statement was made a moment ago relative to steel allocated to the Saudi Arabia field being in the amount of 500,000 tons, as the Senator has stated. The figure I used, as I remember, which appeared in the testimony adduced by the Small Business Committee, was in the neighborhood of from 440,000 to 460,000 tons for the complete construction of the trans-Arabian pipe line and the producing facilities around the eastern part of the peninsula from which the oil comes.

If I remember correctly, however—and the Senator can correct me if I am wrong—360,000 tons of that steel was to go into the pipe line itself. The remainder was to go into the producing field.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Drilling equipment, and so forth.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. When the Small Business Committee discovered what was going on, it took the matter up in executive session with the agencies involved, because the members of the committee felt that the position taken by the agencies was that it did not make any difference in what part of the world petroleum fields were developed; that if petroleum fields were developed anywhere the result would be to help solve the world-petroleum problem. Of course, that argument has considerable merit. On the other hand, at that time much evidence was submitted by those in high military position, by those interested in the national security and in the general welfare—to which the able Senator from New Mexico has referred—who testified that while it was true that the development of the Saudi-Arabian oil fields would mean that oil could be shipped quickly and at less cost to European nations needing oil, yet if steel were allocated in a considerable amount for the development of oil fields in the Western Hemisphere it would mean that oil in sufficient quantity could be had by us not only in time of peace, but in time of war, which would be a very potent weapon in our hands, if needed.

The question then came down to the point: What is the emergency for building a pipe line in Saudi Arabia? The answer was that transportation was involved; that oil could be furnished more quickly and more cheaply from such fields to Europe. It finally developed from the evidence adduced that it was merely a question of a lower rate of transportation. But it was pointed out that an emergency existed here in our country, because there was a shortage of oil, so there was need for developing fields in our country and close to our country, in Mexico.

Oil fields can be developed in Mexico economically, if only sufficient steel can be secured for the purpose. The development of the Saudi-Arabian pipe line

would furnish a cheaper means of transportation than shipment of oil through the Suez Canal, but inasmuch as the oil contemplated to be obtained from such development would not be available until 1952, the contention was that we should proceed to the development of fields in the Western Hemisphere; that wildcatting should be encouraged, and that wells should be drilled in the proven fields in order to increase production in the Western Hemisphere. It was shown that such production would be necessary to promote the general welfare and provide for the common defense of our own country.

As I previously stated, the argument was advanced by some that it made no difference where oil fields were located; that as each new field was developed it would tend to help in solving the problem of the world-wide shortage of oil. But, as I further stated, evidence was also adduced which confirms the position taken by the able Senator from New Mexico, that if possible, the oil should be produced in proven fields in our own country and in fields in Mexico, and in Latin America. Such production, as I have stated, would serve to promote the general welfare and provide for the common defense of the United States, and would also serve as a means of promoting a good-will policy toward our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, my suggestion is simple. I have no objection whatsoever to the development of Saudi-Arabian oil fields, but I do object to the oil companies securing all the steel which is now produced in the United States, and transporting it to Saudi Arabia for the development of fields over there, which will not be of value to us in promoting our national defense or our national economy.

By nature's law and by nature's God, the development of the North American economy is a natural duty imposed upon the people of Canada, the people of the United States, and the people of Mexico. Their economy is a homogeneous economy, and the destinies of all the people who are compelled to live upon it depend, in the ultimate, directly upon the manner of their behavior in developing, exploiting, and utilizing it. In this great duty and in this great destiny, Canada, the United States, and Mexico find themselves bound together as natural partners. As such, each possesses a part and parcel of the whole and is morally bound, for the general welfare of the entire continent, not only to shoulder the burden of its own responsibility toward developing the continent's natural resources, but also to aid another partner, if necessary, to get under way with the same kind of work. Our Chief Executive recently very solemnly has pledged, both to the peoples of Mexico and to those of Canada, the full cooperation of the United States in this very regard.

Mr. President, I hope that what will be done under the pending legislation will be of ultimate good to the world at large. I would not object to an appropriation of three times the amount called for in the bill, and to having the money sent to Europe, if the people of Europe



would in turn set to work, and, by using what we give to them, do everything within their power to place their own economy on its feet.

Three or four days ago representatives from the State Department appeared before a committee of Congress. From what was said in that committee it appears that it is proposed to dangle \$600,000,000 before the countries of Latin America. Is it better to give away to them \$600,000,000, or is it better to sell them something of practical value in developing their own industries, their own natural resources, so we can receive something in return? What is the common sense of the matter? The difficulty is that we are all the time dangling dollars. We should use a little common sense in approaching the problem of what to do which would be of ultimate benefit to the United States, to Latin America, to Mexico, and to the world at large. We should indulge in some common-sense horse trading. Let us give to Latin American countries some of the steel which is going to Saudi Arabia and let them use it in an attempt to work out their own salvation. From whom would they buy the things they need, if they were secure economically? They would buy from the United States. The United States should help them develop their oil fields and other natural resources. If oil fields are developed close to home it will mean much to us in the way of providing a means for our own defense.

Mr. President, having in mind our natural duty toward our good and friendly neighbors in this great and divinely constituted partnership and, as well, the pledge of our country's Chief in that self-same direction, who among us can be justified now in coming forward to advocate the sapping of our economic strength, the stultifying of our growth, by removing our treasure beyond the reach of all of us, by denying the steel necessary to protect our competitive system in the developing of our North American petroleum reserves—who can do this for the sake of aiding in the development of an economy, strange and unnatural to us, far away from us in a remote part of the world, and subject to the will of foreign peoples who very possibly could become future potential enemies of ours or at least easy prey for future potential enemies of our country?

More and more of the American people are becoming sick at heart because of our foolish governmental tendency to give away so substantially of our substance when the gift has to do with purely non-American issues and whilst such policy denies the goods which, under wiser direction, could be used to develop the economy of North America—our home and our next-door neighbors' homes. To be concrete can anyone tell me any sound reason why Mexico should be completely unable to find assistance in her struggle to buy steel from steel mills in America when the Secretary of Defense can so willingly come before us and advocate the shipment thousands of miles away of hundreds of thousands of tons of steel?

Mr. President, I maintain that I am just as patriotic as is the Secretary of Defense.

The defense of America argument surely carries no weight in these considerations for is there a military man worthy of a decoration who will stress the easy defense by us of the Arabian oil fields and their long extended pipe-line system while, at the same time overlooking what is obvious even to the lay person, namely the relatively easy defense of Mexican oil fields, situated as they are on the very porch of the United States of America and constituting a definite portion of the North American economy of which we are such an integral part? In the defense of America our military must defend and can defend our own continent. In any war against a great power dominant in the Middle East, our military would encounter far different and more difficult problems in defending the Arabian oil holding of a few big oil concerns whose policies now selfishly deny even the development of the great and yet undiscovered oil reserves of our sister republic just south of our own border. Logic of our entire present policy in this regard suggests a complete revaluing and, indeed revamping of it. Let us not foolishly follow imperialistic policy to a point of development of large foreign oil fields to dangle before a future enemy as a bite to be taken in one huge gulp on the first unfortunate day of attack. Let us build within the fences around our own shores an economy prosperous and strong enough always to defend ourselves and to make America secure in the world—not a nation to be sapped of her strength by giving away the very substance of nature's gifts with which she has been so bounteously blessed and which now are so essentially needed at home in the development of her own economy. How can this nation of ours, in the face of expressions on the part of our President, whose avowed purpose is to aid our neighbor, Mexico, deny now the development of the Mexican petroleum economy whilst feeding to far off Arabia steel that is essentially required to make good the promise to Mexico?

Answer to this question can be found only in a keen perception of the nature of the influences apparently working among the personnel and the various departments of the executive branch of our government. I charge that too many of our executive officials give too sympathetic ear to the blandishments, the arguments, the subtle propaganda, the one-sided presentations of paid representatives of big oil corporations. I charge that these representatives are well known and well received by our State Department and that a relationship and an acquaintance exists there that makes for bad sledding for the competitors of such big oil corporations in that certain of our public officials do things for these big combines whilst damning enterprises in which they have no participation. But first I must state that in 1938 the Mexican government expropriated, with most excellent reasons in my opinion, the oil properties in Mexico which large American oil corporations for many years had exploited.

Let me give an instance of how they operate. I am willing to make this statement in Wall Street or anywhere else

where I would not be protected by congressional immunity. I wish to tell what an oil man said to me. He had been the manager of a corporation in Mexico for 28 years. I arrived in Mexico City 5 or 6 days after expropriation. When I went into the lobby of the hotel, I met him. I knew him well. He said, "Dennis, let us have a Scotch and soda." So we went to have a Scotch and soda. While there he said, "Things are bad." I knew what he was talking about, namely, expropriation. I said, "What is bad?" He said, "This fellow is crazy." I said, "What fellow?" He was talking about the President of Mexico. After he talked to me, the President of Mexico went up in my estimation.

I said, "Why is he crazy?" He bluntly replied, "He will not take a dime. We used to be able to handle such officials with money and in other ways, but this fellow is crazy. He will not take a dime."

He was talking about the President of Mexico. So the President of Mexico began to go up in my estimation.

The large oil companies used to operate by murder, arson, and robbery. I know American businessmen who would like to go down there and do an honest business, and make money for themselves without robbing the people of Mexico. They would like to produce oil for the United States, and bring a little money into Mexico so that the Mexicans could buy from the United States. But Big Business wants to get in there under its own terms. That is why the small operators are not getting steel.

These expropriated companies today are keenly desirous of returning to Mexico—on their own terms and in the old way—to develop and to exploit forevermore the greatest known wealth of the Mexican Nation. These companies are jealous of any independent enterprise that gives promise of developing, on any fair basis other than one which they, themselves control, the great petroleum reserves of Mexico.

There consequently now exists an effective conspiracy against operations for the development of the oil reserves of Mexico badly needed as this development is. The participants in this conspiracy are certain of the big oil companies and of the big steel companies working in perfect concert to deny the steel requisite for this program.

It is a fact that the steel companies of America, through their subsidiary supply companies or their supply house representatives, follow a definite policy of cultivating their so-called Big Business oil company customers and that the steel companies, through their supply or sales organizations, look to the protection of such Big Business customers by seeing to it that such customers receive a preference when the matter of deliveries of steel supplies is involved. I further charge that supply houses, in deference to their steel company masters, refuse specifically to sell steel casing that is known to be desired for the purpose of use in Mexico, and that the steel companies act in concert with the big oil corporations to this end. Conversely to this line, however, it is known that at least one large oil company, at a time of severe shortage of steel casing, has been



supplied freely by the steel companies with such immense quantities of that particular much-needed product that the company finds itself today possessed of more of such supplies at its properties in the Middle East than it can use for the next 2 years.

I realize the difficulty in coping against such powerful and sinister forces as are found in the world's huge monopolies today. But in the tie-up of the great oil and steel organizations, clothed in hypocrisy and strangely nurtured by influential channels of our own Government, will be found the modus operandi that not only gives driving power to the very grave and dangerous threat that exists today not only for individual initiative and free enterprise in America but also constitutes sabotage of our good-neighbor policy and of our efforts toward continental and hemispherical defense.

That is what ruined the Rio Conference. That is what ruined the Habana Conference. That is what ruins the work of the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Texas in Mexico City. That is what ruins the good-neighbor policy. The monopolists wish to control things for their own selfish purposes.

Within the past few days the State Department has advised Congress that a hemispheric recovery program is contemplated, suggesting to Congress that it appropriate \$600,000,000 for that purpose. I presume it will be more or less of the nature of the program we are now considering.

In my opinion, it might be necessary to appropriate that amount; but if we can do a little trading with those countries in the ordinary American way without trying to influence them, I believe that they can solve their own problems.

Two or three days ago I heard the suggestion that one of the reasons we had to rush this program through and appropriate the money it calls for was the election in Italy. It is a violation of at least the spirit of the Hatch Act for us to appropriate money merely because there is an election in Italy. We might as well stop such use of the mighty dollar. The mighty dollar should be used as a medium of exchange. Let them earn the mighty dollar and help develop their country in that way. That will do more good than dangling before the eyes of our neighbors \$600,000,000 for hemispheric recovery. Dollars are all well and good, but we shall not have recovery in the Western Hemisphere by supplying dollars alone. Talking of supplying \$600,000,000 might have some effect on the representatives of foreign governments in their meeting at the end of this month at Bogota, but it will not bring about economic recovery anywhere. Mr. President, recovery must come at least in part from the efforts of those who wish to achieve recovery. For instance, it will come by having them plant beans or grow cotton or raise other crops rather than by simply having \$600,000,000 dangled before them.

The State Department can do more for its program by insisting that American industry, especially the steel industry, furnish Mexico with oil machinery to develop its potentials. That can

and should be done. Then it could be proved to Latin America that we are good neighbors. Then we could also relieve the oil shortage.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1174) to provide for inactive duty training pay for the Organized Reserve Corps, to provide uniform standards for inactive duty training pay for all Reserve components of the armed forces, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22, after line 20, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

(d) In providing for the performance of any of the functions described in subsection (a) of section 11, the Administrator shall, to the maximum extent consistent with the accomplishment of the purposes of this act, utilize private channels of trade.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this amendment was previously offered in printed form, but I have modified it to some extent.

As the amendment now stands, it simply provides that the Administrator in procuring, processing, transporting, or repairing any of the commodities which he may acquire under this act, shall utilize so far as possible private channels of trade. This amendment has the approval of the State Department, and I think it has the approval of the chairman of the committee. In fact, it is implicit in the bill itself, but it is not spelled out in the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I entirely agree with the able Senator from Georgia. The consideration of the bill in the committee itself constantly emphasized the basic principle which is here stated. So far as the chairman of the committee is concerned, he considers it highly appropriate that the directive should be asserted as indicated in the pending proposal.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Georgia state for me his interpretation of subsection (c), the one preceding his amendment?

Mr. GEORGE. That is an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. I should prefer to have him interpret it. The amendment I am offering has nothing to do with that one.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. GEORGE. All this proposed new subsection is intended to do, Mr. President, is to have the Administrator utilize private channels of trade for procuring and preparing the commodities which he is to acquire. The whole purpose of the amendment is to have those commodities and the services on them secured on a competitive basis, and also to forestall the possibility of the creation of a wholly unnecessary bureaucracy for procurement purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in connection with the amendment just adopted, I wish to make a brief statement, similar to the one I made in respect to the interim-aid bill, regarding freight forwarders and other elements in the normal channels of transportation.

In this bill authority is given for the transportation of supplies to the recipient nations. As is stated in the committee report, however, it is intended that the normal channels of transportation are to be used to the maximum extent practicable to handle these cargoes—which is precisely what the amendment of the Senator from Georgia indicates in a broader sense.

Not only does this envisage the use of privately owned ships, but it is also our intention that private freight-forwarding channels, where normally utilized for handling cargo, shall be used to service any similar cargoes shipped under this bill. In rare cases, of course, such use of commercial forwarders might interfere with the efficient and economical handling of cargoes, and consequently would be undesirable. However, it is our position that ERP cargoes should in almost all cases be handled in accordance with the purposes of section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, usually referred to as the Bland Freight Forwarding Act. It is not intended that Government agencies supplant or take over the functions normally performed by private-enterprise freight forwarders.

Mr. President, I wish to make this additional comment regarding what has just been placed in the bill: I hope it will satisfy the junior Senator from Kansas in respect to the first part of the amendment he has offered in regard to the handling of wheat and flour, an amendment which is still on the clerk's desk awaiting subsequent consideration.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Kentucky has two amendments to submit. One of them is completely without controversy. I suggest that he send that amendment forward first.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.



The CHIEF CLERK. On page 32, between lines 20 and 21, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

WESTERN HEMISPHERE COUNTRIES

SEC. 16. The President shall take appropriate steps to encourage all countries in the Western Hemisphere to make available to participating countries such assistance as they may be able to furnish.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator from Kentucky, the purpose to which he directs his amendment is certainly implicit in the entire plan. The success of the objective which he underscores is highly essential to the success of the entire enterprise. So far as I am concerned, I should be very happy to have the amendment incorporated into the bill.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the distinguished Senator and say to him that his work on the European recovery plan holds my great admiration and respect. I have submitted the amendment to emphasize that if the European recovery program is to succeed, it will need not only the assistance which can be furnished by this country but also the assistance which can be furnished by other countries in the Western Hemisphere. It is expected that the requirements of the 16 participating countries in the way of imports and credits will be satisfied by other countries in North and South America as well as by the United States. On page 24 of the report, which has been filed by the committee, it is shown that there shall be required imports to the total value of \$12,959,100,000 from the Western Hemisphere.

It is estimated that credits in the sum of \$700,000,000 are expected to be furnished by other countries of the Western Hemisphere. If the credits and commodities are not furnished by our neighbors, either the minimum requirements of the program will not be made available and the program will, to the extent of the failure, be endangered, or we will be asked to make up the deficit, curbing inflationary pressures. The amendment will require that the President take all appropriate methods to secure from the other countries of the Western Hemisphere their necessary assistance and cooperation. There is nothing on the record to show that such steps have thus far been taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky has a further amendment, as I understand, which I wish he would submit, to lie upon the table, and to be printed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask be printed and lie upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The bill is open to further amendment.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senate apparently having concluded its

work for the day, I now move that a recess be taken until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 11, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 10 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Eve D. Hester, of Indiana, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Olcott H. Deming, of Connecticut.  
William L. Kilcoin, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John Dorman, of the District of Columbia.  
Raymond E. Lisle, of New York.  
William J. Ronan, of New York.

S. Wilson Clark, of California, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

John J. Deviny, of the District of Columbia, to be Public Printer.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN THE ARMY NURSE CORPS AND THE WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be captains

Genevieve S. Beard, WMSM (PT), M2215.  
Leona F. Koch, WMSM (Diet.), R884.  
Dot Miller, WMSM (Diet.), R2212.  
Jessie L. Miller, WSMC (PT), M2111.  
Elizabeth M. Nevels, WMSM (Diet.), R2209.  
Margaret Stuart, WMSM (Diet.), R537.

To be first lieutenants

Agnes Bacior, ANC, N737362.  
Ethel L. Barnes, WMSM (Diet.), R999.  
Geraldine B. Bernard, ANC, N753081.  
Edith J. Bonnet, ANC, N788513.  
Faith Boyd, ANC, N721777.  
Faunetta L. Brown, ANC, N727101.  
Ann C. Browning, ANC, N762686.  
Martha Carle, ANC, N725819.  
Corinne Casey, ANC, N764298.  
Mary A. Casserly, ANC, N722914.  
Katherine E. Chickering, ANC, N720896.  
Louise M. Coard, ANC, N742037.  
Irene M. Connell, ANC, N757627.  
Gladys R. Corey, ANC, N761393.  
Dorcas E. Coulter, ANC, N755160.  
Edna F. Crandall, ANC, N797540.  
Paula B. Crowe, ANC, N727421.  
Kathleen M. Dean, ANC, N757103.  
Glenice H. Dearborn, ANC, N753327.  
Ada W. Desprez, ANC, N767585.  
Rachel E. Dilleuth, ANC, N725408.  
Irene M. Donahue, ANC, N753537.  
Pauline K. Driscoll, ANC, N732846.  
Ruby I. Easter, ANC, N763533.  
Nellie I. Feagans, ANC, N725433.  
Virginia M. Gillespie, ANC, N745399.  
Thelma R. Glover, ANC, N788312.  
Alyce D. Gordon, ANC, N793629.  
Orpha L. Grimsrud, ANC, N773989.  
Irene I. Guenther, ANC, N775644.  
Corinne R. Hauck, ANC, N755466.  
Mildred J. Hillhouse, ANC, N774678.  
Marynell A. Hoefs, ANC, N735073.  
Betty J. Hughes, ANC, N731300.  
Dorothy J. Hund, ANC, N775948.  
Jane V. Isler, ANC, N723368.  
Oliah Jones, ANC, N795632.

Angie C. Kammeraad, ANC, N731238.  
Elizabeth E. King, ANC, N726050.  
Julia E. Koszalka, ANC, N724630.  
Jean B. Koziol, ANC, N758909.  
Rose Kudletz, ANC, N801068.  
Ruth R. Kuhlmann, ANC, N775178.  
Dorothy E. Kwiatkowski, ANC, N793382.  
Mildred D. Lang, ANC, N729246.  
Hester M. Logar, ANC, N759736.  
Louise M. Malone, ANC, N728197.  
Agnes McMahon, ANC, N754840.  
Margaret M. McManus, ANC, N760419.  
Marian R. McQuiston, ANC, N724987.  
Mary A. Michelitch, ANC, N762272.  
Irene E. Miller, ANC, N731182.  
Ruth T. Mills, ANC, N796495.  
Dorothy E. Mooneyham, ANC, N787360.  
Dorothy B. Morgan, ANC, N778638.  
Mary A. Mulholland, ANC, N769883.  
Anne M. Murphy, ANC, N787887.  
Gladys M. Nash, ANC, N734451.  
Sarah L. Neal, ANC, N787755.  
Anne L. Nodziak, ANC, N759749.  
Alma M. Nyberg, ANC, N720757.  
Ree S. Oler, ANC, N779590.  
Mary E. Pilchard, ANC, N728832.  
Olivette C. Plante, ANC, N721036.  
Ann C. Polchak, ANC, N723095.  
Julia R. Pollack, ANC, N755832.  
Julianne M. Rheume, ANC, N722736.  
Emily M. Rickey, ANC, N762850.  
Mabel L. Rime, ANC, N730455.  
Ruth M. Robinson, ANC, N730523.  
Margaret K. Rucker, ANC, N759826.  
Lucile A. Seaman, ANC, N731657.  
Eugenia M. Sleeve, ANC, N768668.  
Carolyn E. Smith, WMSM (Diet.), R1064.  
Frances A. Soule, ANC, N797596.  
Agatha B. Spaeth, ANC, N779492.  
Margaret C. Stafford, ANC, N771471.  
Valeska B. Staudt, ANC, N788882.  
Annie B. Stewart, ANC, N764389.  
Nellie T. Tamalonis, ANC, N796403.  
Martha J. Taranta, ANC, N722782.  
Lois L. Turnbull, ANC, N732395.  
Maude C. Vertrees, ANC, N787411.  
M. Eloise Watkins, ANC, N725272.  
Marcella Wenderott, ANC, N783472.  
Louise A. Whalen, ANC, N759373.  
Juanita H. Williams, ANC, N734896.  
Eileen A. Wittman, ANC, N758820.  
Mary G. Young, ANC, N743936.  
Nellie J. Zalesney, ANC, N787775.

To be second lieutenants

Ethlyn S. Altmann, ANC, N793948.  
Margaret E. Burk, ANC, N792040.  
Odessa A. Falls, ANC, N769510.  
Helen J. Fitzgerald, ANC, N792063.  
Marilyn A. Goeltz, ANC, N792041.  
Alma E. Gulinn, ANC, N792042.  
Pearl I. Jank, ANC, N792058.  
Phyllis I. Morrow, ANC, N792052.  
Della I. Murphy, ANC, N780358.  
Nancy B. Power, ANC, N765872.  
Katherine W. Schumacher, ANC, N786881.  
Jean E. Thompson, ANC, N795665.  
Signe Trangsrud, ANC, N797818.  
Betty J. Walls, ANC, N778723.  
Marian Waterhouse, ANC, N754612.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Charles DeArmond, June 4, 1948.  
Robert P. Hilton, June 4, 1948.  
Wayne G. Shear, June 4, 1948.

Richard E. Fahrenwald (naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948.

Philip J. McEleney (naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948.

George P. Edgerton (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Glenn E. Drewyer  
James P. Moran



## LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Jonathan M. Allen Robert E. Rowand  
William L. Chapman Robert W. Sharp, Jr.  
Holt B. Maddux Charles R. Sullivan

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

## LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

George S. deShazo  
William I. Gullett

## LIEUTENANTS

Leonard M. Kraske  
Jeremiah T. Sunde  
Allan L. Wallace

## LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Luke J. Braxmeyer  
Gage Colby  
Robert G. Martin

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

## LIEUTENANTS

Eddy L. Harris  
Ingrid C. Suess

## LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Louise J. Bartlett Lillie M. Harwood  
Jane H. Farr Gayle M. Lang

## ENSIGNS

Ann Belaeff Marita D. Petit  
Isabel V. Hunsecker Charlotte S. Rasmussen  
Hedwig L. Kratz Louise W. Sharp

## IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of brigadier general in the United States Marine Corps:  
John T. Selden

## WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 10 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

## POSTMASTER

J. Willard Krause to be postmaster at Manistee in the State of Michigan.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father George E. Shank, of St. Edward's Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

O Almighty God, Divine Lawmaker, we implore You to look upon this gathering, invested with the authority of making laws for the welfare of the people of this Nation.

We realize, oh, O God, that any authority given to us comes from You. We beg You to help us always to keep this in mind, especially in this day when Your laws are so disregarded by many, when so many disregard Your very existence. We also realize, O Lord, that unless You build the house, we who build it labor in vain.

The fact that the Members of this Congress for the past century and a half have called upon You for aid has saved our great Nation from many a catastrophe and has made us victorious in many a crisis.

We thank You, good God, for the privilege we enjoy of calling upon You, when in some parts of the world Your name is not allowed to be mentioned. May this privilege always be ours, and may we always, both in public and pri-

vate life, be guided by the teachings which You have laid down for our happiness in this world and eternal happiness in the world to come. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## THE LATE JAN MASARYK

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, Jan Masaryk is dead!

Early reports from the free radio of Europe named the cause of his death as self-destruction—suicide. It could just as easily have been murder. The Kremlin has never stopped at murder. However it was accomplished, it is enough to know that Jan Masaryk, son of Tomas Masaryk and the Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia, is dead.

What does Jan Masaryk's death mean to Americans?

It means that the Soviet seizure of power in Czechoslovakia was not a bloodless revolution. It means that one man—irrespective of how he died—shed his blood in protest. It means that the patriotic leaders of Czechoslovakia have not supinely surrendered to Russia in mass. It means that millions of Czechs who love liberty are more closely united than ever to millions of Americans who also love liberty. The United States has had its martyred Lincoln. Czechoslovakia has had its martyred Masaryk.

The Czechoslovakian freedom underground from this day henceforward has a spiritual leader.

From this day forward, there will be no rest for the bestial Soviet conqueror.

We Americans—a few of us who have known and talked to Jan Masaryk, and millions of us who have known him only by his deeds—can say on the day of his death: "Jan Masaryk, yesterday Czechoslovakia was free. Tomorrow, aided by your supreme sacrifice, Czechoslovakia will be free once again."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and deeply regretted to hear the report that Jan Masaryk, Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia, was dead, but the spirit of freedom and democracy in Czechoslovakia has not died. It will continue to live until Czechoslovakia frees itself as it has done in the past. The Czech people have never ceased and will not cease now to fight for their freedom.

It was my great privilege to have known the father of Jan Masaryk, Tomas G. Masaryk, who became the first President of Czechoslovakia, and who was recognized, as was our own George Washington, as the Father of His Country. The Masaryk family was a democratic family, believing in democracy and in freedom for its people.

Mr. Speaker, I recollect when Professor Masaryk visited Washington, and it was my privilege early in 1918, during the First World War, to arrange a meeting with President Wilson, at which time he conveyed to the President the aspirations and determinations of the Czech people. It was thought by some persons that it might be well to have a separate peace with Austria-Hungary, but the President, after listening to us, came to the conclusion that it would be unwise and the Allies could not gain anything thereby, and the smaller nations, which had been dominated by the Hapsburgs of Austria-Hungary, would be deprived of an opportunity of self-determination. I was pleased, shortly thereafter, when President Wilson addressed the Congress, calling off the negotiations for a separate peace with Austria-Hungary, and a little later conditions developed in these smaller nations which I had predicted would occur that brought about the overthrow of the Austro-Hungarian Government. Most of these smaller countries thereby succeeded, with our aid, to obtain the freedom and liberty which they had dreamed of, hoped and prayed for, for many years.

Prof. Tomas G. Masaryk, as I have stated, became the first President of that liberty- and freedom-loving newborn Czechoslovakia, and under his leadership it adopted a constitution patterned after our own. Within a few years the country prospered under his guidance and was recognized as the most stable, progressive republic in Europe. Upon the death of President Masaryk, he was succeeded by Eduard Benes, his coworker in the early days of liberation and in the upbuilding of Czechoslovakia after it had attained its independence.

Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the sacrifice of Czechoslovakia on the altar of appeasement. Notwithstanding that misfortune, it never ceased, under the leadership of President Benes and Jan Masaryk in exile, to strive to again attain its independence, freedom, and liberty. When the Nazi hordes swarmed over its borders to be later driven out by the Russians, these patriots returned and again resumed the reins of administration of their Government. Czechoslovakia again started to rebuild and reconstruct and to enjoy the freedom and liberty of which they had been deprived by the Nazis. Appointed as Foreign Minister, Jan Masaryk strove with all his might in cooperating with President Benes in effecting a real democratic form of government. It was his further aim and ambition that Czechoslovakia should lead the way and strive to bring about an understanding between the nations of western and eastern Europe. He actually and honestly believed that any danger of war could be avoided, but when, unfortunately, the Communists seized control of the country, Masaryk, in the interest of peace and to prevent bloodshed, whether voluntarily or involuntarily, continued to hold the post of Foreign Minister. He was quoted as saying he was doing so, having in view the best interests of his country.

Mr. Speaker, I knew the Masaryk family for many years and Jan Masaryk from the beginning of the First World War.